


№ 9335. H A 16 CK



GIVEN BY

HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

Public Law 601

(Section 121, Subsection Q (2))

OCTOBER 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, AND 30, 1947

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION PICTURE INDUSTRY

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES EIGHTIETH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION

Public Law 601 (Section 121, Subsection Q (2))

OCTOBER 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, AND 30, 1947

Printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1947

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

J. PARNELL THOMAS, New Jersey, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota

JOHN S. WOOD, Georgia

JOHN McDOWELL, Pennsylvania

JOHN E. RANKIN, Mississippi

RICHARD M. NIXON, California

J. HARDIN PETERSON, Florida

RICHARD B. VAIL, Illinois

HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina

ROBERT E. STRIPLING, *Chief Investigator*

BENJAMIN MANDEL, *Director of Research*

CONTENTS

October 20, 1947:	
Testimony of—	Page
H. A. Smith	4
A. B. Leckie	5
Louis J. Russell	6
Jack L. Warner	7
Samuel Grosvenor Wood	54
Louis Burt Mayer	69
Ayn Rand	82
October 21, 1947:	
Testimony of—	
Adolph Menjou	91
John Charles Moffitt	108
Rupert Hughes	128
October 22, 1947:	
Testimony of—	
James K. McGuinness	135
Robert Taylor	164
Howard Rushmore	171
Morrie Ryskind	181
October 23, 1947:	
Testimony of—	
Fred Niblo	189
Richard Macaulay	197
Robert Montgomery	203
George L. Murphy	208
Ronald Reagan	213
Gary Cooper	219
Leo McCarey	225
October 24, 1947:	
Testimony of—	
Lela E. Rogers	229
Oliver Carlson	238
Walter E. Disney	280
October 27, 1947:	
Testimony of—	
John Howard Lawson	290
Louis J. Russell	296
Eric Allen Johnston	305
October 28, 1947:	
Testimony of—	
Dalton Trumbo	329
Louis J. Russell	341
Roy M. Brewer	342
Statement of Paul V. McNutt	360
Testimony of—	
Albert Maltz	363
Robert W. Kenny	367
Louis J. Russell	370
Alvah Bessie	383
Louis J. Russell	388
Roy M. Brewer (resumed)	394

October 29, 1947:

Testimony of—

	Page
Samuel Ornitz.....	402
Louis J. Russell.....	405
Herbert Joseph Biberman.....	412
Louis J. Russell.....	415
Emmet G. Lavery.....	419
Edward Dmytryk.....	459
Louis J. Russell.....	462
Adrian Scott.....	466
Louis J. Russell.....	468
Dore Schary.....	469

October 30, 1947:

Testimony of—

Ring Lardner, Jr.....	479
Louis J. Russell.....	483
Lester Cole.....	486
Louis J. Russell.....	489
Berthold Brecht.....	491
Louis J. Russell.....	504

Appendix.....	523
---------------	-----

HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE-INDUSTRY ACTIVITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. The record will show that the following members are present: Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Thomas. A subcommittee is sitting.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Messrs. Louis J. Russell, Robert B. Gaston, H. A. Smith, and A. B. Leckie, investigators; and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research. Before this hearing get under way, I would like to call attention to some of the basic principles by which the Committee on Un-American Activities is being guided in its investigation into alleged subversive influence in America's motion-picture industry.

The committee is well aware of the magnitude of the subject which it is investigating. The motion-picture business represents an investment of billions of dollars. It represents employment for thousands of workers, ranging from unskilled laborers to high-salaried actors and executives. And even more important, the motion-picture industry represents what is probably the largest single vehicle of entertainment for the American public—over 85,000,000 persons attend the movies each week.

However, it is the very magnitude of the scope of the motion-picture industry which makes this investigation so necessary. We all recognize, certainly, the tremendous effect which moving pictures have on their mass audiences, far removed from the Hollywood sets. We all recognize that what the citizen sees and hears in his neighborhood movie house carries a powerful impact on his thoughts and behavior.

With such vast influence over the lives of American citizens as the motion-picture industry exerts, it is not unnatural—in fact, it is very logical—that subversive and undemocratic forces should attempt to use this medium for un-American purposes.

I want to emphasize at the outset of these hearings that the fact that the Committee on Un-American Activities is investigating alleged Communist influence and infiltration in the motion-picture industry must not be considered or interpreted as an attack on the majority of persons associated with this great industry. I have every confidence that the vast majority of movie workers are patriotic and loyal Americans.

This committee, under its mandate from the House of Representatives, has the responsibility of exposing and spotlighting subversive elements wherever they may exist. As I have already pointed out, it is only to be expected that such elements would strive desperately to gain entry to the motion-picture industry, simply because the industry offers such a tremendous weapon for education and propaganda. That Communists have made such an attempt in Hollywood and with considerable success is already evident to this committee from its preliminary investigative work.

The problem of Communist infiltration is not limited to the movie industry. That even our Federal Government has not been immune from the menace is evidenced by the fact that \$11,000,000 is now being spent to rid the Federal service of Communists. Communists are also firmly entrenched in control of a number of large and powerful labor unions in this country. Yet simply because there are Communist union leaders among the longshoremen or seamen, for example, one does not infer that the owners of the shipping industries are Communists and Communist sympathizers, or that the majority of workers in those industries hold to an un-American philosophy. So it is with the movie industry.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the seriousness of Communist infiltration, which we have found to be a mutual problem for many, many different fields of endeavor in the United States. Communists for years have been conducting an unrelentless "boring from within" campaign against America's democratic institutions. While never possessing a large numerical strength, the Communists nevertheless have found that they could dominate the activities of unions or other mass enterprises in this country by capturing a few strategic positions of leadership.

This technique, I am sorry to say, has been amazingly profitable for the Communists. And they have been aided all along the line by non-Communists, who are either sympathetic to the aims of communism or are unwilling to recognize the danger in Communist infiltration.

The ultimate purpose of the Communists is a well-established fact. Despite sporadic statements made to the contrary for reasons of expediency, the Communist movement looks to the establishment of Soviet-dominated, totalitarian governments in all of the countries of the world, and the Communists are willing to use force and violence to achieve this aim if necessary.

The United States is one of the biggest obstacles to this movement. The fact was startlingly illustrated recently by the open announcement of the Communist International—a world-wide party organization dedicated to promoting world-wide Communist revolution, which previously operated underground.

The vituperation leveled at the United States by this new international Communist organization clearly indicated that America is considered the chief stumbling block in the Soviet plans for world domination and is therefore the chief target in what we might call the Soviet Union's ideological war against non-Soviet governments.

There is no question that there are Communists in Hollywood. We cannot minimize their importance there, and that their influence has already made itself felt has been evidenced by internal turmoil in the

industry over the Communist issue. Prominent figures in the motion-picture business have been engaged in a sort of running battle over Communist infiltration for the last 4 or 5 years and a number of anti-Communist organizations have been set up within the industry in an attempt to combat this menace.

The question before this committee, therefore, and the scope of its present inquiry, will be to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in the Hollywood motion-picture industry. We want to know what strategic positions in the industry have been captured by these elements, whose loyalty is pledged in word and deed to the interests of a foreign power.

The committee is determined that the hearings shall be fair and impartial. We have subpoenaed witnesses representing both sides of the question. All we are after are the facts.

Now, I want to make it clear to the witnesses, the audience, the members of the press, and other guests here today that this hearing is going to be conducted in an orderly and dignified manner at all times. But if there is anyone here today or at any of the future sessions of this hearing who entertains any hopes or plans for disrupting the proceedings, he may as well dismiss it from his mind.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman, I am attorney for the 19 subpoenaed witnesses, as is Mr. Bartley Crum. You recall that we submitted a telegram yesterday on a motion to quash. It seems to me that the most orderly way that we can present this would be to do so before a witness has been sworn under any subpoena as the motion would be identical for any witness. If the committee is without constitutional authority to proceed to—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. May I ask your name, please?

Mr. KENNY. Robert Kenny, and this is my associate, Mr. Bartley Crum.

The CHAIRMAN. And you represent the 19 witnesses whose names were listed in the telegram sent to me this morning?

Mr. KENNY. That is right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kenny, these witnesses of yours will not be called until next week, they will not come up today at all, or any other day this week. So if you will present your statement to the committee, we will take it under advisement, and then you can argue the question, if the committee sees fit, when your witnesses come up next Monday—I believe the first witnesses are to come up Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday. So if you will just present your statement to the committee.

Mr. CRUM. Mr. Chairman, may I file—

The CHAIRMAN. Present your statement to the committee.

Mr. CRUM. Thank you. I would like to file this with you, Mr. Chairman.

(A paper was handed to Mr. Stripling.)

The CHAIRMAN. That will be filed. You discuss the matter further when you present your witnesses to the committee.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness today.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will ask Mr. H. A. Smith to take the stand.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry. Just a minute.

I am very sorry, but we have a certain procedure to follow. You, as the former Attorney General in the State of California, know how important it is to follow the procedure. You also know the great necessity for order. It will probably be difficult to maintain order in these hearings. So you will just have to bear with us, Mr. Kenny. You may come back when you present your witnesses next week.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. That is all.

Mr. CRUM. May we ask if we have a right to cross-examine?

The CHAIRMAN. You may not ask one more thing at this time. Please be seated.

Mr. CRUM. Certainly American.

The CHAIRMAN. Raise your right hand, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. SMITH. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Be seated, please.

TESTIMONY OF H. A. SMITH

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Smith, will you state your full name and present address.

Mr. SMITH. My name is H. A. Smith. I reside at 1514 Bel Aire Drive, Glendale, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. SMITH. I was born in Dixon, Ill., in October 1909.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Smith, were you ever employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. SMITH. I was. I was employed as a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 1935 to and including 1942.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you outline for the committee the various positions you have held in the Bureau, and the nature of your work?

Mr. SMITH. During that period of time I worked in a number of various field offices, the last 5 years of which I was assigned to the Los Angeles office. While there I was what is called a No. 1 man, or assistant to the agent in charge.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. We will have to have more order. We will particularly have to have more order from our friends, the photographers. We just can't hear the witness.

Go ahead.

The WITNESS. During that time I was in charge of the internal security investigations of the Los Angeles field division, which had to do with matters relating to the national defense, espionage, sabotage, and all of those related articles—fascism, nazism, and communism.

After resigning from the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1942 I was manager of plant protection at Lockheed Aircraft in charge of security from 1942 until 1944, since which time I have returned to the practice of law and investigation at Los Angeles.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Smith, were you appointed on July 18, 1947, as a special investigator to conduct investigations for the Committee on Un-American Activities into alleged Communist influences in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; I was; and since that time I have been engaged continuously in interviewing hundreds of people, reviewing files, working practically night and day, and Saturday, and Sundays, in an effort to gather information to present to this committee. During the ensuing session I have been assisted in the investigation by Mr. A. B. Leckie.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the record show that Mr. Wood is present and a quorum of the full committee is present.

Mr. SMITH. I have been assisted by Mr. A. B. Leckie—L-e-c-k-i-e.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, those are all the questions I have at this time of Mr. Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any of the members have any questions of Mr. Smith?

Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

Mr. STRIPLING. This is purely for the purpose of identification.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. STRIPLING. I now ask Mr. Leckie to take the stand.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LECKIE. I do.

TESTIMONY OF A. B. LECKIE

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Leckie, will you state your full name and present address?

Mr. LECKIE. A. B. Leckie, 449 North Orlando Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. LECKIE. Born in Greenville, Ala., 1905.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Leckie, were you ever employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. LECKIE. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you outline for the committee the positions you held with the Bureau?

Mr. LECKIE. I served 1 year as administrative assistant to Mr. Hoover. I was a year and a half in charge of the Philadelphia office and was assigned to other offices prior to that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever held any other positions, either in the Bureau or in the armed services of the United States, which would qualify you as an investigator?

Mr. LECKIE. I served in a similar capacity with the United States Navy during the war.

Mr. STRIPLING. From what period?

Mr. LECKIE. From 1942 to 1945, inclusive.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Leckie, you were appointed on July 18, 1947, as a special investigator to assist Mr. Smith in his investigation of

alleged Communist activity in the motion-picture industry; is that true?

Mr. LECKIE. I was; and I have worked continuously with him through the entire time.

Mr. STRIBLING. That is all, Mr. Chairman, at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any members of the committee have any questions?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Leckie.

Mr. STRIBLING. Next, I would like to call Mr. Louis J. Russell.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIBLING. Will you state your full name and present address, Mr. Russell?

Mr. RUSSELL. Louis J. Russell, Washington, D. C.

Mr. STRIBLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. RUSSELL. Louisville, Ky., December 16, 1911.

Mr. STRIBLING. You are presently a member of the investigative staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am, sir.

Mr. STRIBLING. How long have you been an investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. RUSSELL. Since May 1945.

Mr. STRIBLING. Were you ever employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a period of 10 years.

Mr. STRIBLING. What positions did you hold with the Bureau as an investigative agent?

Mr. RUSSELL. While with the Bureau I served in the Indianapolis, Newark, Washington, Hartford, and Oklahoma field divisions. While attached to the Newark field division I was supervising agent in charge of accounting, criminal investigation, and allied subjects.

Mr. STRIBLING. Have you ever at any time been detailed by the Committee on Un-American Activities to proceed to Hollywood to conduct an investigation into alleged Communist influences in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I was; in 1945, during the month of August, I conducted an approximately 3-week investigation in Hollywood, Calif., and following that I conducted further investigation in Washington, D. C., and other cities relating to the Hollywood motion-picture industry.

Mr. STRIBLING. Did you proceed to Hollywood this year for the purpose of making an investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir; during the month of May 1947.

Mr. STRIBLING. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any member of the committee have any questions to ask?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. STRIPLING. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call is Mr. Jack L. Warner.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. WARNER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF JACK L. WARNER

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, are you accompanied by counsel?

Mr. WARNER. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you identify your counsel?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Paul V. McNutt.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. McNutt, do you have any statement you would like to make as to whom you are representing at this hearing?

Mr. McNUTT. Mr. Stripling, I represent the Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., and the Association of Motion Picture Producers, Inc., and their member companies. Mr. Warner's company is a member of both associations.

Mr. STRIPLING. You will be appearing, then, with various witnesses?

Mr. McNUTT. That is true.

Mr. STRIPLING. From time to time?

Mr. McNUTT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you represent in any way the 19 witnesses who are represented by Mr. Kenny and Mr. Crum?

Mr. McNUTT. I do not.

Mr. STRIPLING. You do not.

Just have a seat, Mr. McNutt.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McNutt, the Chair would like to inform you that it is the policy of this committee to permit counsel to advise his client, the witness here on the stand, of his constitutional rights, and only on the question of his constitutional rights.

I would like to say to counsel that we hope you will bear with us in that and that it will not be necessary at any time to remind you of that.

Mr. McNUTT. I understand, Mr. Chairman. Of course, I should like to make a request to be permitted to cross-examine witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. You will not have that permission. It is not the policy of the committee to permit counsel to cross-examine witnesses. You will only have the right, the solemn right, to advise your client, the witness, on his constitutional rights. Nothing else. You are no different from any of the other attorneys who have appeared before this committee this year in the many hearings that we have had.

Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, will you state your full name and present address?

Mr. WARNER. My name is Jack L. Warner, 1801 Angelo Drive, Beverley Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. WARNER. London, Ontario, Canada, 1892.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, you are here before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to a subpoena served upon you on September 29, 1947; is that correct?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. WARNER. In charge of production of Warner Bros. studios at Burbank, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a vice president of Warner Bros.?

Mr. WARNER. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been associated with the motion-picture industry?

Mr. WARNER. Approximately forty-odd years.

Mr. WOOD. I didn't get that last statement.

Mr. WARNER. Forty-odd years.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, in what various capacities have you been associated with the motion-picture industry?

Mr. WARNER. I would say writer, director, producer.

Mr. STRIPLING. When was the corporation known as Warner Bros. first founded?

Mr. WARNER. I just can't remember the exact date.

Mr. STRIPLING. Approximately when?

Mr. WARNER. I believe it was 1922—or between 1922 and 1926. Before that it was a copartnership of the four brothers.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall how many people you employed at the time the corporation was first founded?

Mr. WARNER. I haven't any recollection. No; I don't know.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you familiar with how many people are employed at the present time?

Mr. WARNER. I would say approximately 25,000 throughout the world.

Mr. STRIPLING. Throughout the world.

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. About how many pictures does your company produce a year? That is, on an average.

Mr. WARNER. At present?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. Twenty-four. In addition, what we term "short subjects," and we now have a news release, the Warner-Pathé News Release.

Mr. STRIPLING. When you say 20—

Mr. WARNER. Twenty-four full-length pictures; 50 or 60 short subjects; and 100 or more news releases a year.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you give us the figure of—say, for any time during the past 5 years—the gross income of Warner Bros.?

Mr. WARNER. I am not familiar with the gross income. That was not my end of the business—other than reading the reports.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is Warner Bros. one of the major studios in Hollywood?

Mr. WARNER. One of the large studios. I don't go along with the word "major."

Mr. STRIPLING. Would it be one of the four largest?

Mr. WARNER. I would say it was one of the large studios in Hollywood.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, as the chairman has stated, the purpose of this hearing is to determine the extent of Communist infiltration and influence in the motion-picture industry.

Since you have been in Hollywood, has there ever been a period during which you considered that the Communists had infiltrated into the studios?

Mr. WARNER. Before we proceed, if it is proper, I would like to read a statement that I have prepared into the record.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, it is not the policy of this committee to permit witnesses to read statements. However—

Mr. WOOD. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the witness be permitted to submit his statement.

Mr. WARNER. I read the statement in Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. It was the same statement?

Mr. WARNER. I read the statement in Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. Is this the same statement you read in Los Angeles?

Mr. WARNER. Similar to a degree, more or less.

The CHAIRMAN. May I just see the statement, please?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

(The paper was handed to the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. It will be all right to read this statement. The only reason we questioned it was that we wanted to make certain that it was pertinent to the inquiry.

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir; it is.

The CHAIRMAN. And also will you read it into the microphone, Mr. Warner.

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And speak just a little louder.

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir.

(STATEMENT OF JACK L. WARNER)

It is a privilege to appear again before this committee to help as much as I can in facilitating its work.

I am happy to speak openly and honestly in an inquiry which has for its purpose the reaffirmation of American ideals and democratic processes. As last May, when I appeared before a subcommittee of this group in Los Angeles, my testimony is based on personal opinions, impressions, and beliefs created by the things I have heard, read, and seen. It is given freely and voluntarily.

Our American way of life is under attack from without and from within our national borders. I believe it is the duty of each loyal American to resist those attacks and defeat them.

Freedom is a precious thing. It requires careful nurturing, protection, and encouragement. It has flourished under the guaranties of our American Constitution and Bill of Rights to make this country the ideal of all men who honestly wish to call their souls their own.

I believe that I, as an individual, and our company as an organization of American citizens, must watch always for threats to the American way of life. History teaches the lesson that liberties are won bitterly and may be lost unwittingly.

We have seen recent tragic examples of national and personal freedoms destroyed by dictator-trained wrecking crews. The advance

guards of propagandists and infiltrationists were scarcely noticed at first. They got in their first licks quietly, came into the open only when they were ready to spring the trap. Heedless peoples suddenly woke up to find themselves slaves to dictatorships imposed by skillful and willful groups.

I believe the first line of defense against this familiar pattern is an enlightened public. People aware of threats to their freedom cannot be victimized by the divide-and-conquer policies used by Hitler and his counterparts.

It is my firm conviction that the free American screen has taken its rightful place with the free American press in the first line of defense.

Ideological termites have burrowed into many American industries, organizations, and societies. Wherever they may be, I say let us dig them out and get rid of them. My brothers and I will be happy to subscribe generously to a pest-removal fund. We are willing to establish such a fund to ship to Russia the people who don't like our American system of government and prefer the communistic system to ours.

That's how strongly we feel about the subversives who want to overthrow our free American system.

If there are Communists in our industry, or any other industry, organization, or society who seek to undermine our free institutions, let's find out about it and know who they are. Let the record be spread clear, for all to read and judge. The public is entitled to know the facts. And the motion-picture industry is entitled to have the public know the facts.

Our company is keenly aware of its responsibilities to keep its product free from subversive poisons. With all the vision at my command, I scrutinize the planning and production of our motion pictures. It is my firm belief that there is not a Warner Bros. picture that can fairly be judged to be hostile to our country, or communistic in tone or purpose.

Many charges, including the fantasy of "White House pressure" have been leveled at our wartime production *Mission to Moscow*. In my previous appearance before members of this committee, I explained the origin and purposes of *Mission to Moscow*.

That picture was made when our country was fighting for its existence, with Russia as one of our allies. It was made to fulfill the same wartime purpose for which we made such other pictures as *Air Force*, *This Is the Army*, *Objective Burma*, *Destination Tokyo*, *Action in the North Atlantic*, and a great many more.

If making *Mission to Moscow* in 1942 was a subversive activity, then the American Liberty ships which carried food and guns to Russian allies and the American naval vessels which convoyed them were likewise engaged in subversive activities. The picture was made only to help a desperate war effort and not for posterity.

The Warner Bros. interest in the preservation of the American way of life is no new thing with our company. Ever since we began making motion pictures we have fostered American ideals and done what we could to protect them.

Not content with merely warning against dangers to our free system, Warner Bros. has practiced a policy of positive Americanism. We have gone, and will continue to go, to all possible lengths to iterate and reiterate the realities and advantages of America.

Good American common sense is the determining factor in judging motion-picture scripts before they are put in production and motion-picture scenes after they are photographed. We rely upon a deep-rooted, pervading respect for our country's principles.

One of those American principles is the right to gripe and criticize in an effort to improve. That right to gripe is not enjoyed under communistic dictatorships. To surrender that privilege under pressure would betray our American standards.

Freedom of expression, however, does not, under our Constitution and laws, include a license to destroy.

We believe positive methods offer the best defense against possible subversive activities. In my previous testimony before a subcommittee of this committee, I stated certain people whom we let go were subsequently hired by other studios.

By no stretch of the imagination can that be construed as questioning the loyalty of other employers. The producers who hired the men we discharged are good Americans. There is no positive guide to determine whether or not a person is a Communist; and the laws of our land, which are in the hands of you gentlemen, offer no clean-cut definition on that point.

We can't fight dictatorships by borrowing dictatorial methods. Nor can we defend freedom by curtailing liberties, but we can attack with a free press and a free screen.

Subversive germs breed in dark corners. Let's get light into those corners. That, I believe, is the purpose of this hearing and I am happy to have had the opportunity to testify.

Thank you.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, getting back to my original question—

MR. WARNER. Do you want this statement for the record?

MR. STRIPLING. That will be made a part of the record, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. So ordered.¹

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, since you have been in Hollywood, has there ever been a period during which you considered that the Communists or the Fascists had infiltrated into the studios?

MR. WARNER. As I said in Los Angeles on May 16, I believe—15, rather—I have never seen a Communist, and I wouldn't know one if I saw one.

With reference to Fascists. I have seen them. Not in America. I mean in Europe. Therefore, I don't know if Fascists have worked in the studios—or Communists, rather—or both.

MR. STRIPLING. I have here before me, Mr. Warner, your testimony, wherein the following question was asked:²

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, since you have been in Hollywood has there ever been a period during which you considered that the Communists had infiltrated into your studio?

MR. WARNER. Yes. Do you mean by huge numbers, or what?

MR. STRIPLING. In any degree.

MR. WARNER. Yes; there has been a period.

MR. STRIPLING. When was that?

¹ See appendix, p. 523, for statement exhibit 1.

² See appendix, p. 523, for testimony of Jack L. Warner before the Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, May 15, 1947, in Hollywood, Calif.

Mr. WARNER. Chiefly I would say starting in about 1936 or 1937. That is the first time I started to notice that type of writing coming into our scenarios. It is being put into scripts to this day in one form or another.

Mr. STRIPLING. In your studio?

Mr. WARNER. In our studio and every studio; yes. * * *

Now, that is your testimony, Mr. Warner?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; that wasn't your question. You asked me if there were any Communists in the industry. If you refer directly to our studio, I would like to answer along the same lines I attempted to answer in Los Angeles.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your answer?

Mr. WARNER. The same as that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. WARNER. The answer is that there are people with un-American leanings who have been writing—mostly in the writing division—that have been writing types of—what I personally term un-American principles, for the want of a better word.

The CHAIRMAN. You admit that there are, or were, Communists, or Communist sympathizers, in your own industry?

Mr. WARNER. I don't know about Communist sympathizers. I know they are un-American in their methods.

Mr. STRIPLING. In his studio, he means.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean un-American because they are Communists or un-American because they are Fascists?

Mr. WARNER. No; un-American because they endeavor to put several things into scripts that, in my opinion, are un-American, and it is my business to see that it doesn't get in. If it eventually does creep in, I cut it out.

The CHAIRMAN. There is little difference whether a person is a Communist or a Fascist if he is un-American; isn't that true?

Mr. WARNER. I am not qualified to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. But you admit there are some people in your studio that are un-American?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; I admit that.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. WARNER. I admit it through the process which I have just stated, in the method of writing script. Their other activities I know nothing about.

Mr. STRIPLING. As I understand it, Mr. Warner, the testimony that you gave in Los Angeles was to the effect that you detected within your studio writers who were attempting to inject Communist propaganda into pictures. Your testimony was to the effect that they were not successful in that effort?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. You gave us the names of a number of writers whom you dismissed for one reason or other because you felt they were attempting to inject communism or Communist propaganda into the pictures.

Mr. WARNER. I say un-American propaganda. If you want to use the word "Communist" naturally you have that prerogative.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you give the committee the names of the writers who were employed in your studio whom you considered were attempting to place Communist propaganda in motion pictures?

Mr. WARNER. As I said, again referring to my statement, or testimony, endeavoring to put in Communist propaganda, as I said in my statement—

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, would you prefer that we proceed this way, I will read your testimony and you can confirm it or deny it, as you see fit?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. The following question was asked you:

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that the principal medium, the writers, through which the Communists have sought to inject their Communist propaganda into films?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; I would say 95 percent.

Mr. STRIPLING. Ninety-five percent is through the writers?

Mr. WARNER. This is my own personal opinion.

Mr. STRIPLING. You say at the present time to your knowledge there are no Communist writers in your studio?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct, sir. I did not finish telling you how we released them or got rid of them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Go right ahead.

Mr. WARNER. I think it is worth finishing. Anyone whom I thought was a Communist, or read in the papers that he was, I dismissed at the expiration of his contract. If it was for an individual picture and we had no obligations, we could let him go. In one fellow's case I had to hold onto him because we were dropping them too rapidly, and it was too apparent. So we held onto him. I held him until the last 2 weeks, and I could not stand him any longer. He was contributing nothing by holding meetings in the offices.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was his name?

Mr. WARNER. Kahn; Gordon Kahn.

Mr. STRIPLING. Why did you say it was too apparent?

Mr. WARNER. By letting them all go at once, in one day. When I say "all" there were only probably a half dozen at tops. There weren't so many.

Mr. STRIPLING. But they were definitely entrenched in your studio?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Now, down to that point that is the testimony you gave; is it not?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; it is.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this is sworn testimony which I am reading.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have since gotten them out?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. If there is anyone else in there I don't know who he is. There may be some in other places. Mr. Matthews is checking up very rigidly.

The Mr. Matthews referred to here is Mr. Blaney Matthews; is that right?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. He occupies the position of plant—

Mr. WARNER. Plant personnel.

Mr. STRIPLING (continuing) :

Mr. THOMAS. Do you want to get the names of the other writers?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes; I would like to have those from the record, either from you or Mr. Matthews.

Mr. WARNER. When I say these people are Communists, as I said before, it is from hearsay. It was from printed forms I read in the Hollywood Reporter.

Mr. THOMAS. But you got enough information to let them go?

Mr. WARNER. I could tell in their writings and method of presentation of screen plays.

Mr. STRIPLING. You mean not calling them Communists?

Mr. WARNER. They were un-American.

Mr. STRIPLING. For one reason or another you objected to the lines they were attempting to put in your scripts?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. And you let these six people go. Can you name the six?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; I think I can. I wish you would bear with me.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right.

Mr. WARNER. I have heard these people stand around and ridicule and rib the committee, your full committee: "They aren't looking for Fascists; they are only looking for Communists. They have the same routine; to belittle the other fellow and scheme about it."

Mr. THOMAS. If you have any names we would like to have them.

Mr. WARNER. Here are the names of people who in my opinion wrote for the screen and tried to inject these ideas, and I personally removed them—according to my best judgment or any of my executives working with me. Whether or not they are Communists I don't know, but some of them are, according to what I have read and heard.

The first one is Alvah Bessie. Then Gordon Kahn. He is in charge of editing the little journal of the Screen Writers' Guild. He is now down in Mexico trying to write a story about a picture we were producing down there. I gave instructions all along the line not to have him in there, but he gets in. The day I let him go he was right on the plane for Mexico. He is writing a story for Holiday magazine, one of the Curtis Publishing Co.'s magazines. I tried through the New York office to tell them the fellow was "off the beam" and should not accept his material. I was told, "You are not going to interfere with the right of free speech and freedom of the press." I got the usual run-down of a publisher. That is what they told my man. I tried to have the story stopped for this particular paper, but he is writing it. In fact, we were chastised for interfering with their business, so I got off of that.

Guy Endore, Howard Koch, Ring Lardner, Jr., Emmett Lavery, John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Robert Rosson, Erwin Shaw, Dalton Trumbo, John Wexley. You know these names.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a very familiar list.

Mr. WARNER. Julius and Philip Epstein, twins.

Mr. THOMAS. What are they doing?

Mr. WARNER. They are at M-G-M. I will give you my theory of what happened to these fellows when I finish.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. WARNER. Sheridan Gibney, Clifford Odets. That is all of my list.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were all of these writers that you named employed in your studio at one time or another?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; they were.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you give us the names of some of the pictures in which they injected their lines or propaganda?

Mr. WARNER. I would rather correct that, if you don't mind.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right.

Mr. WARNER. They endeavor to inject it. Whatever I could do about it—I took it out.

Mr. STRIPLING. Tell us some of the pictures in which they endeavored to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. As I understand it, this was all sworn testimony in executive session; is that correct?

Mr. STRIPLING. That is right, sir.

The testimony continued:

Mr. WARNER. Do you want the names?

Mr. STRIPLING. Identify the films.

Mr. WARNER. Alvah Bessie, The Very Thought of You. Gordon Kahn, Her Kind of Man. I might inject there for a moment, the majority of these writers, some of them wrote for as high as 6, 8, or 10 months, and never delivered anything. What they were doing was taking your money and supposedly writing your scripts and trying to get these doctrines into the films, working for the party, or whatever the term is. The strange thing is very few of these fellows deliver.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that right?

Mr. WARNER. Not only in our studios, but in any of the studios. I can speak authoritatively on that. These are the credits that these people have. They are always in every one of them. Howard Koch, In Our Time. I might explain

how some of these stories come out. Sometimes four or five of these writers contribute. These fellows contribute and then three other good writers are doing the most of it, but they contribute some things and they get the screen credit. I should have had more information as to who collaborated with them. They didn't do anything in the western pictures. As far as Koch is concerned, he was on 20 scripts, but he never got anywhere because he always started out with big messages and I used to take them out. This fellow was on contract and I couldn't let him go. He is now working for Samuel Goldwyn. I can't remember the name of the picture he is working on.

Ring Lardner, Jr., was on several pictures. He didn't put any message in *The Kokomo Kid*. Or Emmett Lavery, he has no credits. We throw his stuff in all the way and pile it up.

John Howard Lawson, Action in the North Atlantic.

Albert Maltz in *Pride of the Marines*.

Mr. THOMAS. Did he get much into *Pride of the Marines*?

Mr. WARNER. No; in my opinion he didn't get in anything because everything they endeavor to write in, if they photographed it, I cut it out. I ran those films myself. There is one little thing where the fellow on the train said, "My name is Jones, so I can't get a job." It was this kid named Diamond, a Jewish boy, in the marines, a hero at Guadalcanal. In fact, I had a couple of boys run the picture 3 or 4 days ago and I read it. Dr. John Leach said something about it, but there is nothing to it. If there is, I don't know where it is.

I have had experiences from 1916 or 1917. I made *My Four Years in Germany* and I produced that in New York right during the First World War. I can look at a mirror and see three faces. You can see anything you want to see and you can write anything you want to, but there is nothing in my pictures that I cannot qualify being there, with the exception that it might have gotten by me, because you can't be superhuman. Some of these lines have innuendos and double meanings, and things like that, and you have to take 8 or 10 Harvard law courses to find out what they mean.

Mr. STRIPLING. They are very subtle.

Mr. WARNER. Exceedingly so. Rossen, I gave him a credit for *They Won't Forget* and *Dust Be My Destiny*.

Erwin Shaw, *The Hard Way*.

Dalton Trumbo worked in our place in 1935 and 1936. He had credit for *The Kid From Kokomo*, and so has Ring Lardner, Jr. It gives you an idea; they work in pairs. All he is credited with is *The Road Gang*. I can't remember that. That was 12 years ago.

John Wexley had a picture called *City for Conquest* in 1940. Some of these pictures I have called off were produced during the war. Naturally, they were pictures aimed at aiding the war effort. They were realistic. Take *Action in the North Atlantic*, which was produced for the merchant marine because at the time they could not get proper enlistments and all that. I made this film. We did not pull any punches. It was a good, hard film of the real life of the merchant marine. I don't know whether you saw it or not.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. Naturally, John Howard Lawson tried to swing a lot of things in there, but to my knowledge there wasn't anything.

Mr. STRIPLING. John Howard Lawson did try to put stuff in?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; I would say he did in one form or another.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right, are you through with the list?

Mr. WARNER. No; the Epstein brothers did very good work at one time, but they fell off.

Mr. THOMAS. Did they do any part of *Mission to Moscow*?

Mr. WARNER. Their name is not on here as credit for that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Who did *Mission to Moscow*?

Mr. WARNER. Howard Koch, 1943.

Mr. THOMAS. Did he do any part of *Edge of Darkness*?

Mr. WARNER. No; just a moment, please. Robert Rossen did that in 1942. That was a war subject, too.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not do *North Star*, did you?

Mr. WARNER. No; we did not.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not do *Song of Russia*?

Mr. WARNER. No; we did not. The Epstein brothers worked on a picture called *Animal Kingdom*. As I recall, that was aimed at the capitalistic system—not exactly, but the rich man is always the villain. Of course, those fellows getting

two or three thousand dollars a week aren't rich men. I don't know what you would call them. Both of those fellows work together. They are never separated.

The rest of them are a lot of comedies: Yankee Doodle Dandy, the Man Who Came to Dinner, Arsenic and Old Lace, Strawberry Blonde, Four Mothers—all of those pictures are comedies and there is no taint of communism in them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, do you desire me to proceed in this manner, that is, reading the testimony in directly, or do you wish me to proceed in question-and-answer form?

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to know from Mr. Warner at this point whether he still believes as he did when he testified in California on May 15, I think it was, the testimony of which was just read?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, I do, with one exception, and that is referring to the Curtis Publishing Co. I didn't elaborate too much as I have formed sort of a habit of being very curt in my speech, having to talk all day in my particular business, so I didn't go into too much detail about that.

I meant this: That the Curtis Publishing Co. by refusing—at least to anybody from our company—to publish this Gordon Kahn's article, good or bad, whatever it was, I don't know, proves decisively that the American way of life, free speech and free press, is very, very important to retain and to never let it go. If anyone could influence Curtis Publishing Co. they could influence anybody. Therefore, I believe—I pay my deep respects to the Curtis Publishing Co. for their American stand on free press and free speech.

The CHAIRMAN. On all those other names you would make the same statement in relation to them today as you did on May 15?

Mr. WARNER. I would with the exception that I have looked up one or two of the men; it has been so far back. I was naturally carried away at the time with this testimony being taken. I was rather emotional, being in a very emotional business, to a degree. There are several names here, one or two that I mentioned that I haven't any recollection of at this time, after careful investigation, having written any subversive elements.

The CHAIRMAN. You better name them.

Mr. WARNER. Guy Endore—it has been so long ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you would take him off the list?

The WITNESS. Yes, sir. Sheridan Gibney. As I stated, I hope fully here, I have referred to Julius and Philip Epstein in this one particular picture. The rest of the time they were always on very good American films and there is very little can be said about them. As I said, they do it in a joking way. The rich man is always the villain, which is as old as the world itself. Ever since one man had \$1 and the other fellow had another dollar there has always been that envy between man and man.

Outside of that, I would say these people whom I have mentioned have not written Communist doctrines, or endeavored to put in Communist stories.

As I explained at our meeting in Los Angeles, my understanding of the Communists or their doctrines is that they are a nation or a country or a party or a sect, who endeavor to overthrow a country or a government by violence and force. That I have never seen in an American motion picture, not only ours, but anybody else's.

The CHAIRMAN. They would not be that foolish, would they?

Mr. WARNER. I can't answer for them. I only speak from my own actual experiences and my relations with every man. I find there has been very little of it—remove that, if you please. I find these people have not attacked the Government with violence and overthrowing.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you think it would be very foolish for a Communist or a Communist sympathizer to attempt to write a script advocating the overthrow of the Government by force or violence?

Mr. WARNER. Do you wish me to answer that as a motion-picture executive or as an American citizen?

The CHAIRMAN. Either one, it makes no difference, you are both.

Mr. WARNER. It would not only be foolish, it would be something they could not get away with in the American motion-picture industry in California, or anywhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly. So what would they do? They would put in slanted lines wherever they could and that is what you have been trying to keep out?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. That is why you have been doing exactly the same thing in your business that we have been attempting to do in ours?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. You have detected these slanted lines, lines that Communists or un-Americans, as you call them, would try to put in?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And because of that you have discharged a number of employees; isn't that true?

Mr. WARNER. I wouldn't use the word "discharged." I have had them fulfill their legal obligations and then didn't renew their options, or whatever you would call it.

The CHAIRMAN. But you did not rehire them?

Mr. WARNER. I did not rehire them; that is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other member of the committee have any questions to ask of Mr. Warner at this point?

Mr. VAIL. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Warner, I gathered from Mr. McNutt's opening statement that there is an Association of Motion Picture Producers in California. Is your own firm a member of that association?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir; the Motion Picture Producers Association is the name of it.

Mr. VAIL. Are you an officer of the association?

Mr. WARNER. I am not; no, sir.

Mr. VAIL. In your testimony, you stated certain of your employees were discharged on suspicion, apparently, of being Communists and they were promptly hired by your competitors. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. WARNER. Some of them were; yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. VAIL. What is the purpose of the association?

Mr. WARNER. The purpose of the association has nothing whatever to do with the hiring or firing or making of any terms of business contracts. The business is the motion-picture industry and the production field is very highly competitive. The association has nothing whatsoever to do with whom we engage.

I would call it the sort of an organization where we handle mutual affairs as to business in general, civic matters, and things of that nature that happen in Los Angeles and in the industry in general.

Mr. VAIL. Does the association comprise all the important producers?

Mr. WARNER. It comprises all types of producers.

Mr. VAIL. Is it all-inclusive? Does it include all the producers?

Mr. WARNER. No; it does not. There is another association that is headed by Donald Nelson, the Society of Independent American Motion Picture Producers; I think that is the title, which has many more members.

Mr. VAIL. Wouldn't such an association provide a splendid piece of machinery for distribution of information between producers as to the type of individuals that are employed by the industry and who are concerned with subversive activities?

Mr. WARNER. Of course, that has never been brought up in the association in any manner, shape, or form, by word or written form, to my knowledge. I am rather active in the association. Of course, I don't believe it would be legal in my opinion—speaking only personally—to have the association or any men band together to obstruct the employment of any other man.

I don't believe the association would have anything whatsoever to do with that type of operation. I would not be a party to it and neither would any of the other men, from my knowledge of them.

Mr. VAIL. Since we recognize the fact that motion pictures represent a forceful vehicle for the distribution of subversive information it would seem to me that would be a very important bit of business for your association. In other words, the association has a very grave responsibility, it seems to me: To disseminate knowledge and information to the American people that will not distort the viewpoint of the people who see your pictures. So wouldn't that follow?

Mr. WARNER. That sounds rather logical, but it doesn't hold water. It doesn't happen, and I can't see how it ever will happen unless there are the proper laws created by you gentlemen in order to make a thing like that legal, possible, active, and effectual. I wouldn't be a party with anyone in an association, especially where you would be liable for having a fellow's livelihood impaired; I wouldn't want to do that.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Warner, would you be deeply concerned with the assurance of a livelihood to the individual who is endeavoring to destroy this form of government by force of arms, or violence?

Mr. WARNER. Would I personally?

Mr. VAIL. Or your association.

Mr. WARNER. I couldn't hear you very well. Would you repeat that?

Mr. VAIL. Would you be deeply interested in providing a livelihood for the individual who was attempting by subversive methods to destroy this form of government?

Mr. WARNER. I cannot, at any time, during this hearing, speak for anyone but myself in my business capacity and as an American citizen. Therefore, as for myself, definitely I am against any type of man creating, not only in motion pictures, but in any other enterprise, anything that would endeavor in any form, shape, or manner to overthrow the democracy of the United States of America.

I am absolutely against them and I would not engage them personally. I have said that before, and I will always say that. There is no place for them in the American way of life; I don't care whether it is motion pictures, in Grand Rapids where they make furniture, or in Detroit where they make motorcars. I am very emphatic about that.

I feel very proud to be an American. I spent three-odd months in Europe, and I saw the consequences of people who killed laws, who destroyed freedom of enterprise, individual enterprise, private enterprise. I saw it in Europe, I saw it during the war, I saw it in Italy, France; and to a degree in England.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. VAIL. Those are all the questions I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Just one question, Mr. Warner.

You indicate Congress hasn't said what a Communist is. You know, of course, this committee has before it a resolution outlawing Communists and also another resolution defining Communists. Would you advocate that the Congress adopt either of these resolutions?

Mr. WARNER. This is the first I knew that there was a resolution. I never heard of it. It was probably while I was away. I would advocate it providing it did not take away the rights of a free citizen, a good American to make a livelihood, and also that it would not interfere with the Constitution of the United States, as well as the Bill of Rights.

Mr. McDOWELL. You know, during Hitler's regime they passed a law in Germany outlawing communism and the Communists went to jail. Would you advocate the same thing here?

Mr. WARNER. I am not an authority on Hitler's maneuvers and, what is more, I don't believe I want to be—I am positive I don't want to be, having seen the destruction of those people. It is a very sad thing. Everyone in this room and everyone in the world knows the consequences of that type of law.

Mr. McDOWELL. Canada has a similar law; also Panama, and many South American countries. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. On that question, following up Mr. McDowell, in view of the facts that this bill is before us to outlaw the Communist Party and that laws have been passed outlawing the Communist Party in other nations in this hemisphere, would you advocate that we outlaw the Communist Party?

Mr. WARNER. By the proper legal procedures.

The CHAIRMAN. If we passed a law that would be a proper legal procedure, wouldn't it?

Mr. WARNER. I, as an individual citizen, naturally am in favor of anything that is good for all Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you in favor of outlawing the Communist Party?

Mr. WARNER. You mean from the ballot?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; making it an illegal organization.

Mr. WARNER. I am in favor of making it an illegal organization.

The CHAIRMAN. You are?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Warner, you stated we can't fight dictatorships by borrowing dictatorial methods. As I understand your observation there, it is that if we adopt the same methods the dictatorships adopted in Germany and Italy, and which the Communist dictatorships in Russia and other Communist-dominated countries are adopting, if we adopt those methods in fighting communism in the United States we will be no better than they are from the standpoint of so-called freedom of expression, which you advocated very strongly in your statement?

Mr. WARNER. By that I mean we learn the folly of the type of laws they adopted. I am not qualified to say just what laws we should have, but we certainly do not want to go along in their pattern.

Mr. NIXON. You think it is essential we maintain in America a free press, free speech, and a free screen as the best safeguards against dictatorship?

Mr. WARNER. Definitely; because if we do not—and I speak for myself as an American, we will have a repetition of what they had in the destroyed countries abroad. They had laws which completely closed everything.

Mr. NIXON. Such as Germany and Italy?

Mr. WARNER. Germany and Italy and when the Germans overran these other countries everything was closed. There was not a radio that wasn't planted; the words were put into the narrator's mouth. There wasn't any free press; there were not any movies shown, only as to the destruction of man by the Nazis. I saw pictures made before the war that forecast everything that happened during the war. That is, I saw these pictures in Europe.

Mr. NIXON. Have you had occasion during the past few years to see any Russian motion pictures?

Mr. WARNER. The only Russian picture I ever saw was an old silent film about a battleship—*Potemkin*—or some name like that. They put words into the actors' mouths; they made it a talking film. That is the only one I ever saw.

Mr. NIXON. From your knowledge and experience, would you say they have what you would term a free screen in Russia today; that is, they can make any kind of a picture they would like to?

Mr. WARNER. Only from what I have read in the free press in America do I know what is going on in Russia.

Mr. NIXON. What have you read in the free press in America?

Mr. WARNER. My own individual conclusion is that everything is censored, and you cannot do anything you want to do.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, from what you have read in the press, which is free in America, the situation in Communist Russia today is the same as it was in Nazi Germany, insofar as a free screen or free press or free speech is concerned?

Mr. WARNER. No; I cannot say that I know that. I don't know it. Not having been there I really don't know just how they control it. I do know what Hitler and Mussolini did, but I don't know what the Russian Government is doing today.

Mr. NIXON. You think it is possible that in Russia today they do have a free screen and free press? You follow the statements that are made in the American press to the contrary; do you not?

Mr. WARNER. I question that they have anything free there, from what I have read of it in American newspapers.

Mr. NIXON. Then so far as you are concerned, with your vital interest in the free press and the free screen, and in maintaining that in America, you believe it would be essential that we not have in the United States a form of government, totalitarian form of government, be it Nazi, Fascist, or Communist, which would when it came into power immediately deny a free press, free speech, and a free screen?

Mr. WARNER. I definitely am adverse to it with all my strength and will oppose it with all my strength because it is my recollection that the first thing Hitler did was to remove the press. As a matter of fact, credit is given to Goering for taking over the important Berlin newspapers. Hitler had always had one; Goebbels had his in Munich or one of the German cities.

The next thing they did was to remove the motion pictures. No one could make pictures except the Nazis or under their direction.

Mr. NIXON. That is one of the reasons Warner Bros. before the war, and even during the early years of the war, made so many effective pictures describing what was happening in Fascist Germany and to a less extent in totalitarian Italy?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, sir; exactly.

Mr. NIXON. Because you were interested in maintaining a free system here and you did not want to see that thing come over here?

Mr. WARNER. Definitely, and in addition to that, we produced a film called *Confessions of a Nazi Spy* where we endeavored on a free screen by freemen to awaken the democracies of America and England and others to this terrible menace that faced them. I may go to Europe once or twice a year and I hear things in general that I heard way back in 1936 and 1937. That was my last trip to Germany—in 1937. That is the reason for making the film.

Mr. NIXON. You made those films because you wanted to protect free speech and the free press in America?

Mr. WARNER. Definitely—not only in America, but in other civilized portions of the world where men can be freemen.

Mr. NIXON. Consequently, then, you would feel it was a patriotic duty which you as a motion-picture producer have, to oppose as well as you possibly can at any time the infiltration into your industry of writers or others who in some way or other would attempt to put into those pictures certain lines of propaganda which have as their aim and their purpose the setting up in the United States of a totalitarian system of government, be it Fascist, or Communist; which would destroy the rights that you have now to make any kind of a picture you want to make?

Mr. WARNER. I am for everything that you have said.

Mr. NIXON. You agree with that statement?

Mr. WARNER. I agree wholeheartedly.

Mr. NIXON. The statement was a little long.

Mr. WARNER. It was a very good statement; it was the statement of a real American, and I am proud of it.

Mr. NIXON. Now, I note that you made 24 pictures a year, including 50 or 60 short subjects. I also notice, as probably most of us did who go to the movies—and I saw *Confessions of a Nazi Spy* which, incidentally was a very fine job—that you have made a considerable number of pictures in which you have pointed out the methods of totalitarian dictatorships—the way they deny free speech and free press,

so that Americans would be able to watch for that sort of thing in our own country and be able to resist it.

Mr. WARNER. Pardon me. May I offer a list of 43 films—43 of maybe 100 or more dating back to 1917, when I produced *My Four Years in Germany*, under the former Ambassador to Germany at that time, James W. Gerard.

If you go right on down through this list you will find a real effort to do exactly as you stated a few minutes ago in your rather lengthy speech—which was good. I want to repeat that. I don't think we should be too tense on this. Being too tense, I think you end up without any tense.

Here is a photostatic copy of a review in a *Motion-Picture News* magazine, March 23, 1918, virtually 30 years ago. It is in 10 reels. If you want to see it it is a silent film and runs for about an hour and a half. It told the story of what led up to World War I and between World War I and World War II. This is my opinion of what it did. The pictures speak for themselves. May I offer that in evidence?

Mr. NIXON. I would like to have these pictures made a part of the record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.³

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

March 21, 1918.....	<i>My Four Years in Germany.</i> By James W. Gerard.
December 15, 1918....	<i>Kaiser's Finish.</i>
1919.....	<i>Beware.</i> By James W. Gerard.
December 11, 1923....	<i>George Washington, Jr.</i> By George M. Cohan.
March 12, 1927.....	<i>The Better Ole.</i> By Bruce Bairnsfather and Arthur Eliot.
August 10, 1930.....	<i>The Dawn Patrol.</i> By John Monk Saunders and Howard Hawks.
June 20, 1931.....	<i>Men of the Sky.</i> By Jerome Kern and Otto Harbach.
September 12, 1931....	<i>Alexander Hamilton.</i> By George Arliss and Mary P. Hamlin.
October 3, 1931.....	<i>Penrod and Sam.</i> By Booth Tarkington.
February 27, 1937....	<i>Penrod and Sam (remake).</i> By Booth Tarkington.
July 21, 1934.....	<i>Here Comes the Navy (reissue June 7, 1941).</i> By Ban Markson.
October 12, 1935.....	<i>Shipmates Forever.</i> By Delmer Daves.
October 11, 1941.....	<i>International Squadron.</i> By Frank Wead.
August 22, 1936.....	<i>China Clipper.</i> By Frank Wead.
January 30, 1937....	<i>Black Legion.</i> By Robert Lord.
February 20, 1937....	<i>Green Light.</i> By Lloyd Douglas.
November 27, 1937....	<i>Submarine D-1.</i> By Frank Wead.
February 11, 1939....	<i>Wings of the Navy.</i> By Michael Fessier.
May 6, 1939.....	<i>Confessions of a Nazi Spy.</i> By Milton Krims (from articles by Leon G. Turrón).
January 27, 1940....	<i>The Fighting 69th.</i> By Norman Reilly Raine, Fred Niblo, Jr., and Dean Franklin.
October 5, 1940.....	<i>Knute Rockne—All American.</i> By Robert Buckner.
August 30, 1941.....	<i>Dive Bomber.</i> By Frank Wead.
November 1, 1941....	<i>One Foot in Heaven.</i> By Hartzell Spence.
February 21, 1942....	<i>Captains of the Clouds.</i> By Roland Gillett and Arthur T. Horman.
July 4, 1942.....	<i>Sergeant York.</i> By Alvin C. York.
July 18, 1942.....	<i>Wings for the Eagle.</i> By Byron Morgan and Ben Harrison Orkow.
September 5, 1942....	<i>Across the Pacific.</i> By Robert Carson.
January 2, 1943.....	<i>Yankee Doodle Dandy.</i> By Robert Buckner.
January 23, 1943....	<i>Casablanca.</i> By Murray Burnett and Jean Alison.
March 20, 1943.....	<i>Air Force.</i> By Dudley Nichols.
June 12, 1943.....	<i>Action in the North Atlantic.</i> By Guy Gilpatric.

³ See appendix, p. 523, for exhibits 3 and 4.

August 14, 1943.....	This Is the Army. By Irving Berlin.
September 4, 1943....	Watch on the Rhine. By Lillian Hellman.
October 23, 1943.....	Princess O'Rourke. By Norman Krasna.
January 1, 1944.....	Destination Tokyo. By Steve Fisher.
May 6, 1944.....	The Adventures of Mark Twain. By Alan LeMay and Harold M. Sherman.
December 30, 1944....	Hollywood Canteen. By Delmer Daves.
February 17, 1945....	Objective Burma. By Alvah Bessie.
April 7, 1945.....	God Is My Co-Pilot. By Col. Robert Lee Scott, Jr.
September 1, 1945....	Pride of the Marines. By Roger Butterfield.
March 30, 1946.....	Saratoga Trunk. By Edna Ferber.
August 17, 1946.....	Two Guys From Milwaukee. By Charles Hoffman and I. A. L. Diamone.

[Motion Picture News, March 23, 1918]

MY FOUR YEARS IN GERMANY

(My Four Years in Germany, Inc.—10 reels)

Reviewed by Peter Milne

Ambassador James W. Gerard's widely read book, *My Four Years in Germany*, relating his experiences as representative of the United States Government in the center of Prussianism, makes a stirring patriotic propaganda as rendered into film form by Charles A. Logue, who prepared a scenario, and by William Nigh, who directed.

Last Sunday night at the Knickerbocker Theater when the film received its premiere presentation, there was hardly a minute when the house did not ring with applause that turned into cheers.

All the wily diplomacy with which the heads of the German Nation sought to deceive the United States through its representative, all the atrocities witnessed by Mr. Gerard, such as the mistreatment of the English prisoners, the deportation of helpless Belgian women, perpetrated without regard for any sense of international law—these and a large assortment of views of Allied troops on the march make capital seeing for the man who goes into the theater ready to have his emotions stirred against the common enemy.

While there is no personal story interwoven with the facts, these in themselves are fully dramatic enough to make the 10 reels pass tirelessly. There is no stone left unturned to arouse the audience to a sense that the German manner of conducting war is synonymous with barbarism.

One witnesses the heartrending sight of helpless prisoners shot down before German firing squads because "there will be less mouths to feed," of English and Russian soldiers placed in the same pens together so that the former contract diseases common among the latter, and feeding of the prisoners as dogs.

All of which Mr. Gerard was an eyewitness—and more—is utilized to spread the propaganda.

The sense of humor of the director is oftentimes obvious. It was, indeed, a praise-worthy sense when it came to the production. One long line of actual horrors and of German intrigue would be rather fatiguing without some relief. This is introduced in the way of an element of burlesque on the German Emperor, the Crown Prince, and the other war lords of Germany. These touches registered every time during the initial showing, and they are the kind that will be appreciated by any audience.

The scenes of real troops with which the film is crowded are well woven into the matter picturized from Mr. Gerard's book, and usually to more rousing effect than if they had merely been shown by themselves. When the Kaiser laughs at his enemies it makes one feel pretty fine when these same enemies are shown preparing for battle with a vengeance.

Halbert Brown, a man who might be mistaken for Mr. Gerard by his best friend, impersonates him in the picture. He makes an impressive and dignified figure of the American diplomat. Mr. Gerard himself cannot complain—at least he didn't in his speech last Sunday night. Louis Dean presented a good make-up as the Kaiser and had been imbued with some sense of the autocratic majesty of the part, his characterization might have been perfect.

Fred Hern and Percy Standing, respectively, playing Minister Von Jagow and Secretary Zimmerman succeeded in bringing out the cunning German diplomacy in realistic style. Earl Schenck as the Crown Prince, George Riddell as von

Hindenburg, Frank Stone as Prince Henry, Karl Dane as Bethmann-Hollweg, and Arthur C. Duvel as von Falkenhayn generally have convincing make-ups and play to good effect.

Mr. Nigh himself plays the part of a German social democrat whose excellent convictions are finally overwhelmed by inborn patriotism. His tragic story, terminating with his final stand for helpless prisoners, adds a valuable personal touch to the picture, though it is not very prominent. A. B. Conkwright, as his companion in the Reichstag, in whom blood lust predominates after the outbreak of the war, also contributes a valuable characterization.

My Four Years in Germany exposes the inner workings of the German political and military machine and lets its audience know why America is at war as clearly as did Mr. Gerard's book.

Mr. WARNER. I have 39 subjects here, all pro-American short subjects.

Mr. NIXON. How many of those are there, Mr. Warner?

Mr. WARNER. Thirty-nine. This is a list of those really to the point. It starts out with Song of a Nation, and runs right on down to one called It Happened in Springfield.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be placed in the record.⁴
(The document referred to is as follows:)

PRO-AMERICAN SHORT SUBJECTS

<i>Release date</i>	<i>Title</i>
July 4, 1936-----	Song of a Nation (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Frank McDonald. Writers: Screen play by Forrest Barnes. Stars: Donald Woods, Claire Dodd, Joseph Crehan.
February 20, 1937----	Under Southern Stars (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Nick Grinde. Writers: Story and screen play by Forrest Barnes. Stars: Fred Lawrence, Jane Bryan, Wayne Morris.
December 19, 1936---	Give Me Liberty (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: B. Reeves Eaton. Writers: Story and screen play by Forrest Barnes. Stars: John Litel, Nedda Harrigan.
November 27, 1937---	Man Without a Country, the (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Crane Wilbur. Writers: Screen play by Forrest Barnes; adapted from story by Edward Everett Hale. Stars: John Litel, Gloria Holden, Theodore Osborne
February 24, 1939---	Romance of Louisiana (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Written and directed by Crane Wilbur. Stars: Addison Richards, Crane Wilbur, Orville Alderman.
August 19, 1939-----	Bill of Rights (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Crane Wilbur. Writers: Original screen play by Charles Tedford. Stars: Ted Osborne, Maroni Olson.
May 27, 1939-----	Sons of Liberty (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Michael Curtiz. Writers: Original screen play by Crane Wilbur. Stars: Claude Rains, Gale Sondergaard, Donald Crisp.

⁴ See appendix, p. 523, for exhibits 5 and 6.

PRO-AMERICAN SHORT SUBJECTS—Continued

<i>Release date</i>	<i>Title</i>
February 11, 1939---	Lincoln in the White House (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: William McGann. Writers: Original screen play by Charles Tedford. Stars: Frank McGlynn, Sr., Dickie Moore.
November 26, 1938---	Declaration of Independence (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Crane Wilbur. Writers: Original screen play by Charles Tedford. Stars: John Litel, Ted Osborne, Roselle Towne.
July 1, 1939-----	Right Way, the. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Crane Wilbur. Writers: Original screen play by Dore Schary. Stars: Irene Rich, Gabriel Dell, Henry O'Neill.
August 31, 1940-----	Service With the Colors (dedicated to U. S. Army). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Writers: Original screen play by Owen Crump. Stars: Robert Armstrong, William Landigan.
February 24, 1940----	Teddy the Rough Rider (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Ray Enright. Writers: Original screen play by Charles Tedford. Stars: Sidney Blackmer, Pierre Watkin, Theodore Von Eltz.
December 23, 1939---	Old Hickory (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Lew Seiler. Writers: Screen play by Don Rayn and Owen Crump. Stars: Hugh Sothorn, Nana Bryant, Victor Kilian.
October 14, 1939----	Monroe Doctrine (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Crane Wilbur. Writers: Original screen play by Charles Tedford. Stars: Grant Mitchell, James Stephenson.
October 19, 1940----	Flag of Humanity (patriotic series). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Jean Negulesco. Writers: Written by Charles Tedford. Stars: Nana Bryant, Fay Helm.
June 20, 1942-----	March of America. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Writers: Written by Owen Crump, narrated by Richard Whorf.
November 28, 1942--	Spirit of West Point, The. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Jean Negulesco.
September 5, 1942---	Spirit of Annapolis, The. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Jean Negulesco.
February 27, 1943---	Army Show. Director: Jean Negulesco. Writers: Based on radio program Soldiers With Wings.
November 4, 1944---	Champions of the Future. Producer: Howard Hill. Director: Howard Hill. Writers: Narration written by Roger Z. Denny.
March 18, 1944-----	Chinatown Champs. Producer: Van Campen Heilner and A. Pam Blumenthal. Director: Andre De La Varre. Writers: Narration written by Jack Scholl.
November 6, 1943---	Our Alaskan Frontier. Writers: Narration written by Carl Dudley.

PRO-AMERICAN SHORT SUBJECTS—Continued

<i>Release date</i>	<i>Title</i>
April 29, 1944-----	Our Frontier in Italy. Writers: Narration written by Saul Elkins.
August 12, 1945-----	Devil Boats.
April 28, 1945-----	It Happened in Springfield. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Crane Wilbur. Writers: Crane Wilbur. Stars: Andrea King, Warren Douglas, Charles Drake, John Qualen.
November 11, 1944---	I Won't Play. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Crane Wilbur. Writers: Story by Laurence Schwab. Screen play by James Bloodworth. Stars: Dane Clark, Janis Paige, Warren Douglas, Robert Shayne, William Haade, William Benedict.
December 23, 1944---	I Am an American. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Crane Wilbur. Writers: Written by Crane Wilbur.
August 4, 1943-----	America the Beautiful. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Writers: Narration by Owen Crump and Saul Elkins.
February 3, 1945----	Pledge to Bataan. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead; associate, Herbert T. Edwards. Director: David Griffin. Writers: Narration by Ralph Schoolman and Charles L. Tedford.
September 1, 1945---	Miracle Makers (reissue). Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Owen Crump. Writers: From additional film by Lester Ilfeld.
October 13, 1945-----	Star in the Night. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Don Siegel. Writers: Screen play by Saul Elkins. From a story by Robert Finch. Stars: J. Carrol Naish, Donald Woods, Rosina Galli.
October 10, 1945-----	Sports Go to War. Producers: A. Pam Blumenthal and Andre De La Varre. Supervised by Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Van Campen Heilner. Writer: Narration written by Charles L. Tedford.
March 30, 1946-----	All Aboard. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Carl Dudley. Writer: Saul Elkins.
August 24, 1946-----	Men of Tomorrow. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Saul Elkins. Writer: Saul Elkins.
June 15, 1946-----	Hawaiian Memories. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: John D. Craig. Writer: Narration by Saul Elkins.
October 19, 1946-----	Star Spangled City. Producer: Gordon Hollingshead. Director: Carl Dudley. Writer: Narration written by Charles Linton Tedford
1945-----	Divide and Conquer.
1946-----	Hitler Lives. Academy award winning short. Power Behind the Nation.

[Congressional Record—Proceedings and debates of the 80th Cong., 1st sess.]

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON EDUCATION IN PATRIOTISM
THROUGH MOTION PICTURES

In the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, July 16, 1947

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, there is before the Senate a measure by the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont recommending Government production of films about the American system of constitutional government. It is proposed to make these films available to schools as educational documents in order to inculcate into our young people a better understanding of the American system.

This is a notable purpose. But I should like to see such films shown to that very large portion of our adult population which attends the motion-picture theaters. In my opinion it is just as important for our adults to see such motion pictures as it is for our children.

In this connection, I want to call the attention of this body to an important venture of a similar nature already accomplished through private enterprise. During the past decade there has been produced a series of patriotic featurettes in color about American history. Not only have they been widely exhibited in theaters, but they have been available in recent years without profit for non-theatrical showings by churches, educational institutions, patriotic organizations, and clubs. The Treasury Department, itself, distributed the most recent of the series—*America the Beautiful*, a technicolor production.

These films were made by Warner Bros., one of the great motion-picture producers, with a fine sense of civic responsibility and good citizenship. When their theater engagements had been completed, they were made into 16-millimeter films for schools and civic bodies to show. Some of the finest actors of the motion-picture industry appeared in them, and the productions were of the highest artistic caliber.

Because of the new bill, I am glad to call attention to the timeliness of the Warner Bros. featurettes, and to mention some of their titles and topics.

The first was *The Song of a Nation*, which told the story of how the Star-Spangled Banner came to be written. Released to theaters on June 4, 1946, it proved so successful that a whole series of historical shorts followed.

Give Me Liberty made moviegoers part of the audience which heard Patrick Henry make his stirring speech to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1775. Other outstanding pictures of these series have been:

The Declaration of Independence, showing the signing of that historic document; *The Bill of Rights*, in which audiences saw the fight for a free press and free speech; *Sons of Liberty*, portraying Haym Soloman; the *Romance of Louisiana*, with James Monroe negotiating the great Louisiana Purchase.

Theater audiences also saw President Monroe read his historic message to Congress in *The Monroe Doctrine*; saw the defense of New Orleans by Andrew Jackson in *Old Hickory*; and a dramatization of the famous *Man Without a Country*. There were also *Lincoln in the White House*, to give one side of the *War Between the States*; and *Under Southern Stars*, to give the other. The final picture was *Teddy, the Rough Rider*.

Song of a Nation was reissued last May and is again being shown in the theaters, while I understand that *Teddy, the Rough Rider*, will come out once more next season, with some of the others to follow.

This is a good time to take note of these fine productions. World affairs are in an uncertain state, and there is a tug of war between our kind of country and communistic dictatorship. Our people tend to take America for granted and to forget why it came about and the heroism and sacrifice which went into making our Nation's greatness.

I am so glad that this splendid series of patriotic motion pictures is available not only to schools but to the adult population as well. It is important that movies like these be shown in our theaters today, not only to educate the children but also to reeducate the adults.

The skill and patriotic efforts of those at the Warner Bros. studios who prepared these dramatizations of the making of our Republic should be given full recognition. It is proper and fitting that Warner Bros. should be commended here in the United States Senate for this important contribution to good citizenship. It is an outstanding example of this kind of service that motion pictures can render to the Nation.

Mr. WARNER. I just want to give you the last one or two. One is running now—I won't say at what theater—but one is running. It is

in technicolor, and it is worth seeing. Every American should see it; not only every American, but every foreigner who thinks he wants to be an American.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Warner, I hope some of these other producers speak as well for some of their pictures.

Mr. WARNER. You can find in these pictures, gentlemen, pictures like Give Me Liberty, Man Without a Country, Romance of Louisiana; also the Bill of Rights, Lincoln in the White House, Declaration of Independence, Teddy, the Rough Rider, Old Hickory, Monroe Doctrine, Flag of Humanity. A good one to see is March On, America. I Am an American; that is a very good film we should all see again to reaffirm what this country is all about. It was written during the height of the war in England. America the Beautiful—

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead with your questions.

Mr. WARNER. I want the American people to know about that.

The CHAIRMAN. They will know about it. It will be in the record.

Mr. WARNER. I want to make sure it is in the record. Also, here is a pro-American film produced by Warner Bros. studies, without profit, in cooperation with the United States armed forces. The last one was called The Last Bomb. It is in technicolor. It was made by the United States Army Air Force and is worth seeing. These are 26 pictures. I won't give you the names of all, but they were all for the war effort.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Warner, I think I can see why you have been so successful in selling your pictures to the American public.

Getting back to my original point, Warner Bros. has made a great number of very effective antitotalitarian pictures in which they pointed out the dangers of fascism and nazism. They have also made some very effective films under what we might term "selling America" pictures, in which you point out the benefits of our American system and in which you describe the freedoms which we have here.

You have also said you make about 24 full-length pictures a year and 50 or 60 short subjects. You have indicated here in your statement that you are willing to establish a fund to ship to Russia the people who do not like our system of government and who prefer the Communist system to ours.

You have also indicated from some of your observations that you question the fact that there may be free speech or a free screen in Russia. You have questioned some of the methods; and I am sure if you have just returned from Europe, as I have, and have seen the conditions in Italy and Yugoslavia and in France, you have no question but that the totalitarian methods used by the Communists are no different from those used by the Fascists or Nazis.

Under those circumstances, I would like to know whether or not Warner Bros. has made, or is making at the present time, any pictures pointing out the methods and the evils of totalitarian communism, as you so effectively have pointed out the evils of the totalitarian Nazis.

Mr. WARNER. We are preparing, and will make, one film called Up Until Now. That picture has been in the process of writing, but it is a very serious subject, and we have been criticized by some people in messages. I am sure we will come to it a little later. We want to be positive we know what we are doing.

Mr. NIXON. The reason you have not made pictures pointing out the evils of the totalitarian system on the left, as well as on the right,

is, as you have indicated here, that if you did so you would have tremendous objection from within the industry itself?

Mr. WARNER. Not the industry.

Mr. NIXON. When I speak of the industry, I mean the people employed by the industry, the writers; and the people outside who think they have a vested interest in it.

Mr. WARNER. I am not worried about those in the industry who will object, because since the beginning of the ages people have been objecting to what others are doing in their own ranks, but I want to be positive when we make a film pertaining to the activities of the Communists in America, and the Fascists as well, we want to be right in our presentation.

Then we have made, as I told you, 500 subjects showing the positive American way of life. I think that is a great counter to the Communist and Fascist way of life.

Mr. NIXON. I agree with you absolutely, Mr. Warner. I believe it is essential, as you have put it so well in your statement, we must attack with a free press and a free screen. I also believe that you have stated in your statement freedom of expression does not include a license to destroy.

But I think the point still must be well taken; and from your observations, I think you will agree with it, that there is not only a positive duty on the part of you as an American citizen to point out the benefits of our way of life as you are doing so effectively, but also when we see a real, present danger to our system, a danger which would impose upon America a system of government which would deny to all of us the freedoms we now have—as was the case with the Nazis back in 1939 and 1940—it is not only your duty to point out the truth but also the facts, so that the American people will be able to make a choice. If they want that sort of thing, then they should know what it is.

Under the circumstances, I think this committee is glad to hear that Warner Bros. is contemplating for the first time now making a motion picture in which they point out to the American people the dangers of totalitarian communism as well as fascism.

Mr. WARNER. There is one other film we made some years ago called the Black Legion. It was an actual-fact story. It caused quite a furor, down to threats upon lives, and so on. We will certainly continue, as long as we are in the motion-picture industry, to aid this great country of the United States with every ounce of energy we possess. I speak for my brothers and myself.

Mr. NIXON. Thank you very much.

Mr. WARNER. I would like to have this additional list placed in the record; these 26.⁵

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it will be done.

(The list referred to is as follows:)

PRO-AMERICAN SHORT SUBJECTS PRODUCED BY WARNER BROS. STUDIOS

(Produced in cooperation with United States armed forces)

Release date

Title

Nov. 2, 1946----- Last Bomb, The.

In cooperation with United States Army Air Forces.
Supervised by Frank Lloyd.

⁵ See appendix, p. 523, for exhibit 7.

PRO-AMERICAN SHORT SUBJECTS PRODUCED BY WARNER BROS. STUDIOS—Continued

<i>Release date</i>	<i>Title</i>
Apr. 13, 1946-----	Gem of the Ocean (U. S. Navy). Narration by Charles L. Tedford.
September 29, 1945--	Here Comes the Navy Band. Director: Dave Gould. Photographed in cooperation with (U. S. Navy).
January 6, 1945-----	Beachhead to Berlin (U. S. Coastguard). Narration written by Charles Linton Tedford.
August 18, 1945-----	Orders From Tokyo. In cooperation with the Philippine government and the Office of Strategic Services. Prologue by Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Resident Commissioner of the Philippines, to the United States photographer and narrated by David C. Griffin, captain, United States Marine Corps.
September 23, 1944---	Proudly We Serve (U. S. Marine Corps). Director: Crane Wilbur. Writer: Written by Crane Wilbur. Stars: Andrea King, Warren Douglas.
March 3, 1945-----	Navy Nurse (U. S. Navy). Director: D. Ross Lederman. Stars: Andrea King, Marjorie Riordan, Warren Douglas.
July 7, 1945-----	Live and Learn (U. S. Army). Writer: Charles Tedford.
July 21, 1945-----	Yankee Doodle's Daughters (U. S. Army and Navy). Director: Dave Gould.
October 2, 1945-----	Women at War (U. S. Army). Director: Jean Negulesco. Writer: Screen play by Charles L. Tedford. Stars: Faye Emerson, Dorothy Day, Marjorie Hoshelle, Virginia Christine, Robert Warwick.
December 11, 1943---	Task Force (U. S. Coast Guard).
January 1, 1944-----	Into the Clouds (Office of the Quartermaster General, U. S. Army).
October 10, 1942-----	Ship Is Born, A (U. S. Maritime Commission and U. S. Coast Guard). Director: Jean Negulesco. Writer: Written by Capt. Owen Crump.
January 2, 1943-----	Fighting Engineers, The (U. S. Engineering Corps). Director: B. Reaves Eason. Writers: Screen play by Charles Tedford and Owen Crump. Stars: Richard Travis, Robert Armstrong, and James Flavin.
August 7, 1943-----	Mountain Fighters (U. S. Army). Director: B. Reaves Eason. Writer: Screen play by Charles L. Tedford. Stars: John Ridgely, Peter Whitney, Warren Douglas.
June 26, 1943-----	Champions Training Champions. Photographer by Bureau of Aeronautics, United States Navy. Writer: James Bloodworth.
November 7, 1942----	Beyond the Line of Duty. Produced with War Department cooperation. Director: Lewis Seiler. Writer: Edwin Gilbert. Star: Capt. Hewitt T. Wheless, United States Army Air Force.
April 10, 1943-----	Rear Gunner, The. Produced with cooperation of War Department. Director: Ray Enright. Writer: Written by Edwin Gilbert. Stars: Burgess Meredith, Ronald Regan, Tom Neal, Bernard Zanville, Jonathan Hale.

PRO-AMERICAN SHORT SUBJECTS PRODUCED BY WARNER BROS. STUDIOS—Continued

<i>Release date</i>	<i>Title</i>
October 4, 1941-----	Tanks Are Coming, The (U. S. Army). Writer: Original screen play by Owen Crump. Stars: George Tobias, William Justice.
February 7, 1942-----	Soldiers in White (U. S. Army). Writer: Original screen play by Owen Crump. Stars: William Orr, John Litel, Eleanor Parker.
July 25, 1942-----	Men of the Sky (U. S. Army Air Forces). Director: B. Reaves Eason. Writer: Written and narrated by Owen Crump. Stars: Michael Ames, Eleanor Parker.
December 14, 1940---	March on Marines (U. S. Marine Corps). Director: B. Reaves Eason. Writer: Screen play by Owen Crump. Stars: Dennis Moran, John Litel.
February 8, 1941----	Meet the Fleet (U. S. Navy). Director: B. Reaves Eason. Writer: Original screen play by Owen Crump. Stars: Robert Armstrong, William T. Orr.
April 5, 1941-----	Wings of Steel (U. S. Army Air Corps). Director: B. Reaves Eason. Writer: Original screen play by Owen Crump. Stars: Douglas Kennedy, Herbert Anderson.
June 28, 1941-----	Here Comes the Cavalry (U. S. Cavalry). Director: D. Ross Lederman. Writer: Original screen play by Owen Crump. Stars: William Justice, Ralph Byrd.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Warner, I can, of course, appreciate the extreme difficulties confronting producers of pictures in undertaking to screen every employee engaged in the various activities of the picture industry; but what I am concerned with is to ascertain whether or not there is now any producer in America, or responsible studio head, who knowingly maintains under his employment any person who undertakes to inject into pictures un-American doctrines or ideologies which seek to weaken or destroy the form of government under which this Nation has grown to its place amongst the nations of the earth. Do you know of any such producer, and, if so, I would like to have the name.

Mr. WARNER. I personally do not know anyone employing anyone who is willfully or otherwise endeavoring to do anything to the system of American government. As I said earlier—it is what I have read—certain writers have a membership in communistic parties. Some of them haven't denied it after being accused by the press, so I don't know whether they stand convicted or not. I am not the one to judge whether they are Communists or not.

Mr. Wood. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Warner, I would like an opinion from you. You are a very astute man. I recently discovered that some people who helped set up that thing in Europe, in Germany and Italy, have gotten into America. Would you agree with this committee or with me that it would be good for America to take these folks down to Ellis Island and put them on a boat and send them home?

Mr. WARNER. You mean that if anyone comes into this country who endeavors to gain admittance—

Mr. McDOWELL. I mean actual Fascist political figures from Germany and Italy; we have discovered some of them here in the United States. Would you agree with me they ought to be given back to Italy and Germany?

Mr. WARNER. Are they motion-picture people?

Mr. McDOWELL. No; politicians.

Mr. NIXON. It wouldn't make any difference whether they were motion-picture people or otherwise, would it?

Mr. WARNER. This being as to the motion-picture industry I want to be careful what I say; I don't want to get into politics too rapidly.

Mr. McDOWELL. All right.

Mr. WARNER. Don't let them in; not only send them back, but don't let them get off the boat.

Mr. McDOWELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, in mentioning the pictures which you have produced, I noticed you did not mention Mission to Moscow.

Mr. WARNER. What list are you referring to?

Mr. STRIPLING. You referred to the pictures you have made.

Mr. WARNER. Do you want me to read the list?

Mr. STRIPLING. No; but we want to get to Mission to Moscow. Would you like to testify about that here, or do you want me to read your former testimony?

Mr. WARNER. I would like to correct one error that I personally committed by not having the facts in Los Angeles. It is not a great error.

Mr. STRIPLING. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the witness be permitted to correct that statement when we reach it. Shall we proceed with your testimony on Mission to Moscow?

Mr. WARNER. Very well.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, this is the testimony which was given in Los Angeles before the subcommittee regarding the picture Mission to Moscow.

Mr. Stripling to Mr. Warner:

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you asked to make Mission to Moscow?

Mr. WARNER. There is a correction I wish to make.

Mr. STRIPLING. Let me read your first statement.

Mr. WARNER. I just wish the record to show that I want to make a correction.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

Mr. WARNER. I would say we were to a degree. You can put it in that way in one form or another.

Is that what you want to correct?

Mr. WARNER. I would appreciate if I could correct it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Just that answer, or are there other answers?

Mr. WARNER. No; it is on that point.

I would say we were to a degree. You can put it in that way in one form or another.

Then Mr. Thomas said: "Who asked you to make Mission to Moscow?" And I replied, "I would say the former Ambassador Davies."

That is not correct. Since making that statement I have gone over the authentic details of what occurred, and here they are in sequence.

On page 19 at the bottom that question was asked, and if you will go to page 22, you will find that I replied—well, it refers to who contacted us about making the film. I said:

At the time I can't remember if he contacted us, or my brother who was in New York contacted Mr. Davies. I can't say who contacted whom, but I know that we went ahead with it.

Here is the story of what occurred. My brother contacted Mr. Davies after reading *Mission to Moscow* as a best seller on the stands and in the newspapers. Mr. Davies stated, "There are other companies wanting to produce this book and I would be very happy to do business with you if you want to make it," or words to that effect. My brother made the deal with Mr. Davies to make it and it was at my brother's suggestion and not Mr. Davies'. I am rather surprised I said what I did, but I want to stand corrected, if I may.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right, Mr. Warner. Now, I would like to read further, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Mr. Davies come to Hollywood to see you relative to the making of *Mission of Moscow*, or did you confer with him at any time about it in person?

Mr. WARNER. I conferred with him in Washington and we made the deal in the East, in New York or Washington; I have forgotten which. But he did come here when the film was being produced, and he also acted in an advisory capacity throughout the making of the film. As a matter of fact, he appeared in a slight prologue of the picture.

Mr. STRIPLING. Don't you consider very frankly that the film *Mission to Moscow* was in some ways a misinterpretation of the facts, or the existing conditions?

Mr. WARNER. Of the time, you mean?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. In 1942?

Mr. STRIPLING. In other words, certain historical incidents which were portrayed in the film were not true to fact?

Mr. WARNER. Well, all I could go by—I read the novel and spoke to Mr. Davies on many, many occasions. I had to take his word that they were the facts. He had published the novel and we were criticized severely by the press in New York and elsewhere. As I remember, it was started up by this Professor Dewey from Columbia University. From what I read and heard, he was a Trotskyite and they were the ones who objected mostly to this film because of Lenin versus Trotsky—

Mr. STRIPLING. That is Dr. John Dewey?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. That is what I read. He made statements in the New York Times which were as long as the paper was, but as to the actual facts, if they weren't portrayed authentically—I never was in Russia myself and I don't know what they were doing in 1942, other than seeing the events of the battles for Stalingrad and Moscow, which we all saw in the films and read about. But I talked to Mr. Davies about that after we were criticized, and there is only one thing that happens which is a license, what we call condensation in the making of films. We put the two trials in one and the two trials were condensed because if you ran the two trials it would go on for 20 reels. I personally did not consider that film pro-Communist at the time.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, it is 1947. Do you think it is pro-Communist now?

Mr. WARNER. That I would have to think over. Let me pause for a minute and ask you a question or two, if you don't mind. You mean by saying that the type of scenes shown in that film today would that make the picture pro-Communist; is that it?

Mr. THOMAS. You said in 1942.

Mr. WARNER. It was made in 1942.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not believe it was pro-Communist?

Mr. WARNER. No. We were at war at that time.

Mr. THOMAS. Now it is 1947. Do you believe it is pro-Communist?

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you release the film now, in other words?

Mr. WARNER. No; we would not release the film now.

Mr. THOMAS. Why not release the film now?

Mr. WARNER. Because of the way Russia is handling international affairs since the cessation of the war. I consider, in my opinion as an American, that they are advocating communism throughout the world and I am not in any shape, manner, or form in favor of anything like that. In fact, I despise and detest the very word.

Mr. THOMAS. You say Mr. Davies got in touch with you. He was the first one to get in touch with you about the idea of producing this film; is that correct?

Mr. WARNER. At the time I can't remember if he contacted us, or my brother who was in New York contacted Mr. Davies. I can't say who contacted whom, but I know that we went ahead with it.

Mr. THOMAS. Did any other person in the Government contact either you or your brother in connection with producing Mission to Moscow?

Mr. WARNER. Not to my knowledge; no.

Mr. STRIPLING. What about the State Department?

Mr. WARNER. You mean anyone in the State Department that asked us to make it?

Mr. STRIPLING. Were they consulted in any way in this film, or did they consult with you?

Mr. WARNER. I am trying to think hard who—

Mr. STRIPLING. I am being very frank, Mr. Warner.

Mr. WARNER. If you will give me a couple of minutes.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will be very frank with you. The charge is often made and many statements have been made to the committee to the effect that Mission to Moscow was made at the request of our Government as a so-called appeasement or pap to the Russians; in other words, it was produced at the request of the Government. Now, is such a statement without foundation?

Mr. WARNER. I see what you mean. No; it is not without foundation. That is why I am very happy you put it that way. In order to answer that question correctly, I would say there were rumors and many stories to the effect that if Stalingrad fell, Stalin would again join up with Hitler because, naturally, the way the stories were that far back, during the hardest days of the war, from what I could get out of it, is that the authorities in Washington who were conducting the war were afraid if Stalin would make up with Hitler they would destroy the world, not only continental Europe and Russia, but Japan and everything else. And we know what the scheme of things was, that the Japs and Germans were to meet in India or Egypt, I forget just which.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you mean to say some of the Government officials in Washington informed you that they were fearful that Stalin might hook up with Hitler?

Mr. WARNER. No; but that was the tenor of things. It would be pretty hard for me to say that someone told me that, but that was just the general feeling in Washington. Every time I would go there that would be it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Stripling asked a question that I don't think we have had an answer to yet.

Mr. STRIPLING. Let me state further, Mr. Chairman, it has also been charged that this film had the tacit approval, if not the request, of the White House.

Mr. Warner, was there anything that occurred prior to the production of this film which led you to believe that the Government, the Federal Government, desired that this film be made as a contribution to the war effort? In other words, what I want to make clear, there is no desire on the part of the subcommittee to put you or your company on the spot for making Mission to Moscow but if it was made, as in other films, at the request of the Government as a so-called patriotic duty, you would have no other course to follow and you would naturally be expected to do so.

Mr. WARNER. The general feeling as I found it in Washington was a tremendous fear that Stalin might go back with Hitler because he had done it before.

Mr. THOMAS. No. What we want to get at is the reason, not the general feelings.

Mr. WARNER. Yes; but I am just going to come back to that.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. WARNER. The Russians were very discouraged and they figured that the United States was not going to back them up with lend-lease and so on and so forth in sufficient quantities to beat Hitler, which was very, very important to civilization, and the feeling was if a film could be made—and I imagine other things were being done—to assure the Russians and Stalin—

Mr. THOMAS. Can't you be more specific. You say a feeling existed.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. We want to know more about the specific thing, something more than just a general feeling. We want to know the persons in the Government who got in touch with you concerning the making of this film.

Mr. WARNER. Well, I don't think Mr. Davies was in the Government then. He was then ex-Ambassador to Russia and almost everything was dealt through him.

Mr. THOMAS. Did anyone in the State Department get in touch with you or not?

Mr. WARNER. No. I don't know. Not to my knowledge. No one here or in New York.

Mr. THOMAS. Did anyone in the White House get in touch with you?

Mr. WARNER. No, not directly in touch; no, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Not directly in touch?

Mr. WARNER. Do you mean did anyone in the White House say we should make the film for reasons along those lines?

Mr. THOMAS. Directly or indirectly?

Mr. WARNER. Well, as I understood at the time through Mr. Davies that he had contacted the White House and for all of the reasons I recited it was good for the defense and for the prosecution of the war to keep the Russians in there fighting until the proper time when the United States and Britain could organize, in other words, give us time to prepare.

Mr. THOMAS. Let's have the date you started producing that film.

Mr. WARNER. We started November 9, 1942.

Mr. THOMAS. And you completed production when?

Mr. WARNER. On February 2, 1943. It took a little under 4 months.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is rather a quick production, isn't it?

Mr. WARNER. No; that was about the usual length of time. They are usually 8 or 10 weeks.

Mr. STRIPLING. From a commercial standpoint the film was not very successful, was it?

Mr. WARNER. No; it was not exceptionally successful. It was not successful to any great degree. It did very good at first.

Mr. STRIPLING. I mean from what I heard. In fact, there has been testimony it was not very successful.

Mr. WARNER. No; I would not call it very successful. Commercially it wasn't exceedingly successful; no, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, there is one question which I think the subcommittee would like to have cleared up and I think that you as a studio executive could probably give them some information about it.

That testimony, Mr. Chairman, does not deal with Mission to Moscow.

I would like to skip over to the next page, which picks it up again [reading]:

Mr. STRIPLING. If you had not been approached by Mr. Davies or by anyone in the Government indirectly it would have been very likely that you would not have filmed Mission to Moscow?

Mr. WARNER. No; we would not.

Mr. STRIPLING. I think the writers are the most important people in this investigation. I believe you mentioned Koch.

Mr. WARNER. Howard Koch.

Mr. WARNER. Pardon me, you missed some very important information here.

Mr. STRIPLING. I am sorry.

Mr. WARNER. You said the next page, and you skipped a page.

Mr. STRIPLING. I am sorry, Mr. Warner, I did.

Mr. WARNER. If you will go back to page 28 you will find it refers—oh, yes; at the bottom of page 27 [reading]:

Mr. WARNER.—

this is myself speaking—

I was going to say something about that after I recited some of the chronological events of the war in order to confirm my feeling for the reasons that the Gov-

ernment was interested in the making of the picture. This is one of the reasons. I am not here to defend the Government because that is their business.

Mr. THOMAS. We will be glad to have it.

Mr. WARNER. When the Germans were halted at Stalingrad, that was one of the things Mr. Davies told my brother, that it was essential to keep the Russians in there—

Mr. Thomas said "pitching," and I replied:

* * * pitching to give our country a chance to arm, the Navy, the Army, airpower, and everything else, which we were not prepared for at the time, and of course history has told the story.

And I want to introduce the front pages of a New York newspaper, starting with the day following Pearl Harbor, December 8, 1941, right up to December 30, 1942, which gives a very vivid history of the process of the war by the Russians.

The CHAIRMAN. How many pages are there, Mr. Warner?

Mr. WARNER. I am going to read them.

The CHAIRMAN. No. How many are there?

Mr. WARNER. There are about 25—just papers.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take that as an exhibit.⁶

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that the chronological statement which you gave to the committee?

Mr. WARNER. It is, to one degree or another. And I have a copy of the chronological statement, too. I will give you another one, if you want.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. But this tells the story of Russia's distress, Russia getting beaten.

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to receive those as an exhibit.

Go ahead with the questioning, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Howard Koch wrote the script for *Mission to Moscow*?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; he did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was Howard Koch one of those writers whom you subsequently dismissed?

Mr. WARNER. Let us get it correct. I never dismissed anyone for any activity. His contract expired and we didn't renew his contract.

Mr. STRIPLING. You haven't employed him since?

Mr. WARNER. We didn't make a new deal with him.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, when the picture *Mission to Moscow* was made, were you aware that there were certain historical events which were erroneously portrayed in the picture?

Mr. WARNER. I stated the only historical events that I know, by claim of many people—the press and public, in general—were the trials of the purge, or whatever they called it at the time in the book, which was condensed.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner—

Mr. WARNER. I told you, I don't know if it was all correct or not.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Davies was—

Mr. STRIPLING. The point is this, Mr. Warner, that here was a picture which was produced and shown to the American people, and it was shown in other countries, I presume, was it not?

⁶ See appendix, p. 523, for exhibit 8.

Mr. WARNER. I think it was shown in England and several other countries.

Mr. STRIPLING. It was also shown in Moscow, to Mr. Stalin?

Mr. WARNER. In Moscow and to Stalin; yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Here is a picture, however, which portrayed Russia and the Government of Russia in an entirely different light from what it actually was?

Mr. WARNER. I don't know if you can prove it, or that I can prove that it was.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like to read one quotation. I have here, Mr. Chairman, a book entitled "The Curtain Rises," by Quentin Reynolds—

Mr. WARNER. What year was that published in?

Mr. STRIPLING. Copyrighted in 1944.

Mr. WARNER. Well, I had nothing to do with Russia in 1944. I want no part of it. I am not interested—unless you want to put it in the record—in what happened then. That book ended in 1937, when ex-Ambassador Davies returned here.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Reynolds qualifies himself as being a Moscow correspondent.

Mr. WARNER. He wasn't there in 1937.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute, Mr. Warner. Let Mr. Stripling continue.

Mr. STRIPLING. On page 80, he says [reading]:

June 8: Joseph E. Davies left today after a 2-week visit which has left us bewildered. Mr. Davies said that he had come merely to deliver a letter to Stalin. Although he didn't say what the letter contained, we are all convinced that it was a suggestion from President Roosevelt, that he, Stalin, and Churchill meet. What bewilders us (and we are sure bewilders Stalin) is the fact that the President has sent Mr. Davies to deliver the letter. Our Embassy is just across the street from the Kremlin and Ambassador Standley is never too busy to walk over to the Kremlin with a letter.

There was a distinct Hollywood tinge to the Davies visit. The huge DC-4 which brought Davies to Moscow must weigh about 56,000 pounds. It had a crack crew of nine men. Mr. Davies brought his nephew with him to act as his secretary (his nephew is Lieutenant Stamm, a naval officer). Mr. Davies brought his former valet with him to supervise the preparation of his food (his former valet is now a corporal in the United States Army). Mr. Davies brought his personal physician with him, a necessary precaution because Mr. Davies is not in good health. We all admired the courage of Mr. Davies in undertaking a very difficult 16,000-mile trip by air. No one here questions his need of a secretary, a valet, and a physician. But everyone in journalistic and diplomatic circles here questions the necessity of such a formidable entourage to deliver 2 ounces of mail.

Maxim Litvinov arrived a day or so after Mr. Davies, and Litvinov brought a print of the Warner Bros. picture, *Mission to Moscow*, with him. Stalin tendered a dinner to Mr. Davies at the Kremlin a few days after his arrival. It was a typical Kremlin show reserved for visiting big shots with the usual 20 or so courses and 30 or so toasts. The press, of course, is never permitted to breathe the rarified air of Kremlin dinners, but our friends in the various embassies always give us accurate reports of such dinners. To us the real big news of the dinner was the fact that Nikolai Palgunov attended. That meant that he was still in high favor. We had been hoping that his efficiency and poor judgment would by now have percolated up to the sacrosanct presence of Vishinsky or Molotov and that he might be on his way out. The fact that he was at the dinner meant that he was still the white-haired boy in the press department of the foreign office, which is the pressing news for us. The other news was that the film, *Mission to Moscow*, was shown in Stalin's private projection room after the dinner. Some of the British and Americans who have

been here for many, many years, and who really know Russia, told us that Stalin gave a magnificent performance during the showing of the picture.

"Walter Huston was fine," a British member of the diplomatic corps told us, "but he couldn't compare with Stalin. Do you know that Stalin kept a straight face throughout the showing? He didn't laugh once."

A few days later the film was shown at our embassy at one of the usual Saturday afternoon shows. It was a beautiful technical job and the performances of the character actors who figured in the trial scenes were especially magnificent. But the film portrayed a Russia that none of us had ever seen. This would have been all right except that the picture purported to be factual and the Russia shown in the film had as much relation to the Russia we all know as Shangri-la would have to the real Tibet.

Correspondents like Henry Shapiro, Jean Champenois, and Alfred Cholerton who had been in Moscow for many years were bewildered. The film had telescoped two purge trials into one and had not presented them with any degree of accuracy; no fault, of course, in a picture which did not claim to be factual. But this picture did. We all had copies (in English) of the testimony given at the trials and it varied considerably from what was shown on the screen. In the actual trials Radek's had been impassioned and brilliant and Bukharin's vituperative come-backs at Prosecutor Vishinsky's expense masterpieces of invective. The Warner Bros.' or Davies' version differed considerably. In the film Radek is condemned to death. Actually he was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment.

The veteran diplomats were also astounded at the treatment given Lord Chislen in the picture. Chislen was British Ambassador to Russia during Mr. Davies' tenure of the American ambassadorship. In the film he was made out to be a half-wit. Veteran embassy officials and correspondents couldn't understand that at all.

"Litvinov once told me during those days," a correspondent said, "that there were only two foreign diplomats in Moscow he had any respect for. They were Chislen and the German Ambassador Von Schulenberg."

We were all frankly embarrassed by the picture. I was especially amazed because I know the Warner Bros. and their brilliant staff that so faithfully mirrored the careers of men like Dr. Erlich, Pasteur, Zola, and others whom they made subjects of pictures. It was hard to believe that they had made this factually incorrect film. It would have been so easy for Warner Bros. to have called in any correspondent who had spent some time in Russia to check up on factual details. If the purpose of the picture was to improve relations between America and Russia it was completely defeated by the obvious inaccuracies shown on the screen. It was such a pity that no one with any knowledge of Russia was called in to advise on the story. It could have been a great picture and an honest one.

I met one of the officials of Vox the day after the picture was shown to us. Vox passes on all foreign pictures before they are shown in Russia. I asked him if *Mission to Moscow* would be released to the public.

"Well," he hesitated, "we'd like to release it but, of course," he added in perfect seriousness, "we have to cut a great deal of the Russian parts out of it."

Have you ever seen that statement which appeared in Reynolds' book?

Mr. WARNER. No; it is the first time I ever knew that Mr. Reynolds had been in Russia or wrote a book, and if he did it is his own personal opinion. I have nothing to say other than Reynolds speaks of 1944. Our picture, under the guidance of Mr. Joseph E. Davies, speaks up to and including his leaving of the Embassy in Russia in 1937. Again, I have little or nothing to comment. I know nothing about it, other than what you have just read.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, is it your opinion now, Mr. Warner, that *Mission to Moscow* was a factually correct picture, and you made it as such?

Mr. WARNER. I can't remember.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you consider it a propaganda picture?

Mr. WARNER. A propaganda picture——

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. In what sense?

Mr. STRIPLING. In the sense that it portrayed Russia and communism in an entirely different light from what it actually was?

Mr. WARNER. I am on record about 40 times or more that I have never been in Russia. I don't know what Russia was like in 1937 or 1944 or 1947, so how can I tell you if it was right or wrong?

Mr. STRIPLING. Don't you think you were on dangerous ground to produce as a factually correct picture one which portrayed Russia—

Mr. WARNER. No; we were not on dangerous ground in 1942, when we produced it. There was a war on. The world was at stake.

Mr. STRIPLING. In other words—

Mr. WARNER. We made the film to aid in the war effort, which I believe I have already stated.

Mr. STRIPLING. Whether it was true or not?

Mr. WARNER. As far as I was concerned, I considered it true to the extent as written in Mr. Davies' book.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, do you suppose that your picture influenced the people who saw it in this country, the millions of people who saw it in this country?

Mr. WARNER. In my opinion, I can't see how it would influence anyone. We were in war and when you are in a fight you don't ask who the fellow is who is helping you.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, due to the present conditions in the international situation, don't you think it was rather dangerous to write about such a disillusionment as was sought in that picture?

Mr. WARNER. I can't understand why you ask me that question, as to the present conditions. How did I, you, or anyone else know in 1942 what the conditions were going to be in 1947. I stated in my testimony our reason for making the picture, which was to aid the war effort—anticipating what would happen.

Mr. STRIPLING. I don't see that that is aiding the war effort, Mr. Warner—with the cooperation of Mr. Davies or with the approval of the Government—to make a picture which is a fraud in fact.

Mr. WARNER. I want to correct you, very vehemently. There was no cooperation of the Government.

Mr. STRIPLING. You stated there was.

Mr. WARNER. I never stated the Government cooperated in the making of it. If I did, I stand corrected. And I know I didn't.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you want me to read that part, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. No; I think we have gone into this Mission to Moscow at some length.

Mr. WARNER. I would like to go into it at great length, in order to make the Warner Bros.' position to the American public clear, as to why we made the film. You couldn't be more courageous, to help the war effort, than we. Certainly there are inaccuracies in everything. I have seen a million books—using a big term—and there have been inaccuracies in the text. There can be inaccuracies in anything, especially in a creative art. As I said, we condensed the trials—

The CHAIRMAN. We only have 5 minutes this morning. Can we finish with Mr. Warner this morning?

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman. If you would like some qualified reviewer who has seen the picture to give the committee—

The CHAIRMAN. That may come at a later date.

Mr. STRIPLING. I ask that the complete testimony of Mr. Warner [before the subcommittee on Un-American Activities on May 15, 1947, heard in Los Angeles, Calif.] be included in the record at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. So ordered.

(The testimony of Mr. Jack L. Warner is as follows:)

TESTIMONY OF JACK L. WARNER

(The witness was first duly sworn.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Stripling, you may take the witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, will you state your full name and present address, please?

Mr. WARNER. My name is Jack L. Warner. Do you want my business or home address?

Mr. STRIPLING. Your business address.

Mr. WARNER. Warner Bros. Studio, Burbank, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where were you born, Mr. Warner?

Mr. WARNER. I was born in London, Ontario, Canada.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. WARNER. I am vice president of Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., and I am in charge of production of films at our studios.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. WARNER. Since 1912. It was about 1912. I went to San Francisco and came here in 1912.

Mr. STRIPLING. This is a subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives. It is sitting here in Los Angeles to receive any testimony, evidence, or opinion concerning Communist influences or infiltration into the motion-picture industry. The committee in Washington has received during the past 4 months many requests to investigate Communist activities. The subcommittee is here for the purpose of determining whether or not these allegations deserve or require a full-scale investigation. As a motion-picture executive, you have been invited here by the subcommittee to give them the benefit of your views or any information you might have relating to this subject. You can either give a general statement if you like, or if you prefer we will ask you questions.

Mr. WARNER. I think I would prefer questions.

Mr. F. BLAYNEY MATTHEWS. Do you want to read that statement?

Mr. WARNER. At this point I have a statement that I have given to the press and it was run virtually verbatim, of my views, my brother's, or the company's, being the views as I see them of the motion-picture industry.

Mr. THOMAS. When was that statement given to the press?

Mr. MATTHEWS. April 21.

Mr. WARNER. Just a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. THOMAS. How long a statement is it?

Mr. WARNER. It is very short.

Mr. THOMAS. You can go ahead and read it.

Mr. WARNER. I will leave it with the reporter. This statement was released for the press Monday, April 21, 1947, announcing production of the picture Up Until Now.

Backslid Americans, as well as outside enemies of our free institutions, will be exposed in this story of a Boston family. Here at Warner Bros. we have no room for backslid Americans and wishy-washy concepts of Americanism. We believe that our films must reflect positive Americanism founded on the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights.

Up Until Now will not be a "middle of the road" picture about democracy. We do not believe democracy has middle lanes, left detours, or right alleys. The great highway of American liberty is sufficiently broad and straight for all to travel in peace, prosperity, and happiness.

Up Until Now is but another chapter in our war against threats to American democracy. It is not the opening gun by 40 years. It will not be a single barrage. We are working on other topical stories to combat any insidious influence that threatens our country. We will shoot them as rapidly as they are ready for production.

From the day it was founded under the same management that now exists, Warner Bros. has been wholly dedicated to the system of government that has made the American way of life a shining example to peoples throughout the world.

We have been aggressive in our defense of that way of life because we feel we must crusade for the things in which Americans believe. We are happy that other motion-picture producers are joining in the aggressive course Warner Bros. has pioneered, and we hope still others will follow. We cannot combat the enemies of freedom by closing our eyes, shutting our ears, and sealing our mouths. It's better to fight with words, pictures, and ballots than with guns, atomic bombs, and poison gas. American needs awakening.

The backsliders, the in-betweeners, and the straddlers are too content to drift with the dangerous tides the subversive elements are stirring. And too many sound-to-the-core Americans are thoughtlessly ignoring those tides. We've got to jar ourselves into alert awareness of what is going on.

This company has endeavored with all the means at its disposal to keep America alert against the loss of liberties which, if lost, must be redeemed in blood. Through topical entertainment features and short subjects we have retold the lessons so simply and clearly expounded in the three great basic documents of our Government. Through the same media, we have warned of dangers ahead.

One of our first major feature pictures, *My Four Years in Germany*, based on the experiences of former Ambassador James Gerard, was inspired by the dangers facing our Nation in World War I. A short generation later we were first to warn of another and greater peril in *Confessions of a Nazi Spy*.

During the tragically brief interim between our two World Wars we made the short historical films based on the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Our feature films before and during World War II included, among many others, the inspiring life stories of such great Americans as Sgt. Alvin York, Knute Rockne, Mark Twain, and George M. Cohan. At the same time we were filming *I Am a Fugitive From a Chain Gang*, *Black Fury*, *Black Legion*, and other pictures which exposed various evils threatening the American way of life.

During the war period Warner Bros. film production was dedicated to the cause of Allied victory. With the conflict ended, we turned to the urgent task of preserving the peace, which to our way of thinking means preserving the Government of the United States and the American way of life. Our academy-winning documentary *Hitler Lives* was the first postwar picture of perils ahead, using the most flagrant example of what happens to an inert people as warning of what can happen again.

I cite that record in sketchy outline not alone as a matter of pride but as a testimony of the earnestness of the course Warner Bros. will continue to pursue.

We never have used kid gloves or appeasement or middle-of-the-road tactics in dealing with American problems.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, since you have been in Hollywood has there ever been a period during which you considered that the Communists had infiltrated into your studio?

MR. WARNER. Yes. Do you mean by huge numbers or what?

MR. STRIPLING. In any degree.

MR. WARNER. Yes; there has been a period.

MR. STRIPLING. When was that?

MR. WARNER. Chiefly I would say starting in about 1936 or 1937. That is the first time I started to notice that type of writing coming into our scenarios. It is being put into scripts to this day in one form or another.

MR. STRIPLING. In your studio?

MR. WARNER. In our studio and every studio; yes. At present I say there is none of it in ours. No one in our studio is working, to my knowledge, that is a member of any party—Communist or Fascist. On the other hand, I would call them good American men.

MR. STRIPLING. Is that due to an effort on the part of the studio management to purge these people from the studio?

MR. WARNER. Absolutely. I wouldn't know about "purge." That is a tough word. If you don't mind my saying it.

MR. STRIPLING. No.

MR. WARNER. Because that is the thing they use every time we let one go, that here comes a brown shirt or storm trooper.

Mr. STRIPLING. How were they removed? We will use that word. You don't choose to use the word "purge." How were you successful in eliminating these influences from your studio?

Mr. WARNER. By dismissing them, if they were engaged by a picture. There are several methods of hiring writers. I am referring to writers only at this time.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that the principal medium, the writers, through which the Communists have sought to inject their Communist propaganda into films?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; I would say 95 percent.

Mr. STRIPLING. Ninety-five percent is through the writers?

Mr. WARNER. This is only my own personal opinion.

Mr. STRIPLING. You say at the present time to your knowledge there are no Communist writers in your studio?

Mr. WARNER. That is correct, sir. I did not finish telling you how we released them or got rid of them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Go right ahead.

Mr. WARNER. I think it is worth finishing. Anyone whom I thought was a Communist, or read in the papers that he was, was dismissed at the expiration of his contract. If it was for an individual picture and we had no obligations, we could let him go. In one fellow's case I had to hold onto him because we were dropping them too rapidly, and it was too apparent. So we held onto him. I held him until the last 2 weeks, and I could not stand him any longer. He was contributing nothing but holding meetings in the offices.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was his name?

Mr. WARNER. Kahn—Gordon Kahn.

Mr. STRIPLING. Why did you say it was too apparent?

Mr. WARNER. By letting them all go at once, in 1 day. When I say "all" there were only probably a half dozen at tops. There weren't so many.

Mr. STRIPLING. But they were definitely entrenched in your studio?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have since gotten them out?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. If there is anyone else in there I don't know who he is. There may be some in other places. Mr. Matthews is checking up very rigidly.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you want to get the names of the other writers?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. I would like to have those for the record, either from you or Mr. Matthews.

Mr. WARNER. When I say these people are Communists, as I said before, it is from hearsay. It was from printed forms I read in the Hollywood Reporter.

Mr. THOMAS. But you got enough information to let them go?

Mr. WARNER. I could tell in their writing and method of presentation of screen plays.

Mr. STRIPLING. You mean not calling them Communists?

Mr. WARNER. They were un-American.

Mr. STRIPLING. For one reason or another you objected to the lines they were attempting to put in your scripts?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. And you let these six people go. Can you name the six?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; I think I can. I wish you would bear with me.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all right.

Mr. WARNER. I have heard these people stand around and ridicule and rib the committee, your full committee: "They aren't looking for Fascists; they are only looking for Communists. They have the same routine—to belittle the other fellow and scheme about it."

Mr. THOMAS. If you have any names we would like to have them.

Mr. WARNER. Here are the names of people who in my opinion wrote for the screen and tried to inject these ideas, and I personally removed them—according to my best judgment or any of my executives working with me. Whether or not they are Communists I don't know, but some of them are, according to what I have read and heard.

The first one is Alvah Bessie. Then Gordon Kahn. He is in charge of editing the little journal of the Screen Writers' Guild. He is now down in Mexico trying to write a story about a picture we were producing down there. I gave instructions all along the line not to have him in there, but he gets in. The day I let him go he was right on the plane for Mexico. He is writing a story for Holiday magazine, one of the Curtis Publishing Co.'s magazines. I tried through the New York office to tell them the fellow was "off the beam" and should not accept his material. I was told, "You are not going to interfere with the right of free speech

and freedom of the press." I got the usual run-down of a publisher. That is what they told my man. I tried to have the story stopped for this particular paper, but he is writing it. In fact, we were chastised for interfering with their business, so I got off of that.

Guy Endore, Howard Koch, Ring Lardner, Jr., Emmett Lavery, John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Robert Rossen, Erwin Shaw, Dalton Trumbo, John Wexley. You know these names.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a very familiar list.

Mr. WARNER. Julius and Philip Epstein, twins.

Mr. THOMAS. What are they doing?

Mr. WARNER. They are at MGM. I will give you my theory of what happened to these fellows when I finish.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. WARNER. Sheridan Gibney, Clifford Odets. That is all of my list.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were all of those writers that you named employed in your studio at one time or another?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; they were.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you give us the names of some of the pictures in which they injected their lines or propaganda?

Mr. WARNER. I would rather correct that, if you don't mind.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right.

Mr. WARNER. They endeavor to inject it. Whatever I could do about it—I took it out.

Mr. STRIPLING. Tell us some of the pictures in which they endeavor to do that.

Mr. WARNER. Do you want the names?

Mr. STRIPLING. Identify the films.

Mr. WARNER. Alvah Bessie, *The Very Thought of You*. Gordon Kahn, *Her Kind of Man*. I might inject there for a moment, the majority of these writers, some of them wrote for as high as 6, 8, or 10 months and never delivered anything. What they were doing was taking your money and supposedly writing your scripts and trying to get these doctrines into the films, working for the party, or whatever the term is. The strange thing is very few of these fellows deliver.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that right?

Mr. WARNER. Not only in our studios, but in any of the studios. I can speak authoritatively on that. These are the credits that these people have. They are always in every one of them. Howard Koch, *In Our Time*. I might explain how some of these stories come out. Sometimes four or five of these writers contribute. These fellows contribute and three other good writers are doing the most of it, but they contribute some things and get the screen credit. I should have had more information as to who collaborated with them. They didn't do anything in the western pictures. As far as Koch is concerned, he was on 20 scripts, but he never got anywhere because he always started out with big messages and I used to take them out. This fellow was on contract and I couldn't let him go. He is now working for Samuel Goldwyn. I can't remember the name of the picture he is working on.

Ring Lardner, Jr., was on several pictures. He didn't put any message in *The Kokomo Kid*. Or Emmett Lavery—he has no credits. We throw his stuff in all the way and pile it up.

John Howard Lawson, *Action in the North Atlantic*.

Albert Maltz in *Pride of the Marines*.

Mr. THOMAS. Did he get much into *Pride of the Marines*?

Mr. WARNER. No. In my opinion he didn't get in anything because everything they endeavor to write in, if they photographed it, I cut it out. I ran those films myself. There is one little thing where the fellow on the train says, "My name isn't Jones, so I can't get a job." It was this kid named Diamond, a Jewish boy, in the *Marines*, a hero at Guadalcanal. In fact, I had a couple of boys run the pictures 3 or 4 days ago and I read it. Dr. John Leach said something about it, but there is nothing to it. If there is I don't know where it is.

I have had experiences from 1916 or 1917. I made *My Four Years in Germany* and I produced that in New York right during the First World War. I can look in a mirror and see three faces. You can see anything you want to see and you can write anything you want to, but there is nothing in my pictures that I cannot qualify being there, with the exception that it might have gotten by me because you can't be superhuman. Some of these lines have innuendos and double meanings and things like that, and you have to take 8 or 10 Harvard law courses to find out what they mean.

Mr. STRIPLING. They are very subtle.

Mr. WARNER. Exceedingly so. Rosson—I gave him a credit for *They Won't Forget*, and *Dust Be My Destiny*.

Erwin Shaw, *The Hard Way*.

Dalton Trumbo worked in our place in 1935 and 1936. He had credit for *The Kid From Kokomo*, and so has Ring Lardner, Jr. It gives you an idea; they work in pairs. All he is credited with is *The Road Gang*. I can't remember that. That was 12 years ago.

John Wexley had a picture called *City for Conquest* in 1940. Some of these pictures I have called off were produced during the war. Naturally, they were pictures aimed at aiding the war effort. They were realistic. *Take Action* in the North Atlantic, which was produced for the merchant marine because at the time they could not get proper enlistments and all that. I made this film. We did not pull any punches. It was a good, hard film of the real life of the merchant marine. I don't know whether you saw it or not.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. Naturally, John Howard Lawson tried to swing a lot of things in there, but to my knowledge there wasn't anything.

Mr. STRIPLING. John Howard Lawson did try to put stuff in?

Mr. WARNER. Yes; I would say he did in one form or another.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right; are you through with the list?

Mr. WARNER. No. The Epstein brothers did very good work at one time, but they fell off.

Mr. THOMAS. Did they do any part of *Mission to Moscow*?

Mr. WARNER. Their name is not on here as credit for that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Who did *Mission to Moscow*?

Mr. WARNER. Howard Koch, 1943.

Mr. THOMAS. Did they do any part of *Edge of Darkness*?

Mr. WARNER. No. Just a moment, please. Robert Rosson did that in 1942. That was a war subject, too.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not do *North Star*, did you?

Mr. WARNER. No; we did not.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not do *Song of Russia*?

Mr. WARNER. No; we did not. The Epstein brothers worked on a picture called *Animal Kingdom*. As I recall, that was aimed at the capitalistic system—not exactly, but the rich man is always the villain. Of course those fellows getting two or three thousand dollars a week aren't rich men. I don't know what you would call them. Both of those fellows work together. They are never separated.

The rest of them are a lot of comedies; *Yankee Doodle Dandy*, *The Man Who Came to Dinner*, *Arsenic and Old Lace*, *Strawberry Blonde*, *Four Mothers*—all of those pictures are comedies and there is no taint of communism in them.

Mr. THOMAS. Off the record.

Mr. WARNER. I would like to put in the record a few more names.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. Clifford Odets in *Humoresque*. You see, this was way back in 1937—

Mr. STRIPLING. What about *Humoresque*; isn't that a recent release?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. That was written by Clifford Odets. It was a story which we modernized from the old Fannie Hurst novel. In that picture there was no communistic propaganda. I have even written the words down here. It is the old story. There is one line where the boy was mad. John Garfield played the part of the boy and he was mad at John Crawford for romantic reasons and said, "Your father is a banker." He was alluding to the fact fact she was rich and had all of the money. He said, "My father lives over a grocery store." That is very, very subtle, but if you see the film with those lines in it you will see the reason for it. But it is not in the film. I eliminated it from the script. Sometimes you eliminate these things and they leave them in because it plays good and everybody is trying to be a Voltaire. All these writers and actors want to "Voltaire" about freedom of press and freedom of speech. I can go on if you want me to.

Mr. THOMAS. Go ahead.

Mr. WARNER. I didn't get into the record as to their method of getting certain types of propaganda into the motion pictures. When I heard the word communism or fascism I was under the impression it was to overthrow the Government by violence and force, but as I see it being used in motion pictures they do not advocate violence or force at all. That is my experience. But they do advocate

the overthrow of our capitalistic system, as we call it. I never got into it until the last 4 or 5 years when it became apparent to me because naturally, as I said before, you heard the words "communism" and "fascism." You could see Mussolini's Fascists or Hitler's Nazis or Stalin's hordes, or whatever they are. You saw how they came in, by revolution in Russia, or however these things happen. But in reading these hundreds of scripts which I do read and I buy plays and books and novels—it all started to come to me and that is the thing I watch for most earnestly. That is how they get in. If you will watch the films you will find that is what happens.

Now, take the pictures made during the war, the pictures to aid the victory of the Allies or the United Nations. We have no apologies to make for any of those films that we made. They were made by us and we thought it was the right thing to do to aid the war effort, and we never had any rebuffs from anyone. In fact, we were asked to make pictures from time to time by different departments.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you asked to make *Mission to Moscow*?

Mr. WARNER. I would say we were to a degree. You can put it in that way in one form or another.

Mr. THOMAS. Who asked you to make *Mission to Moscow*?

Mr. WARNER. I would say the former Ambassador Davies.

Mr. THOMAS. He asked you to make *Mission to Moscow*?

Mr. WARNER. At the time and he recites why. I brought a small résumé of it when we entered into the agreement, and so forth, with the events of the war in the early part of 1942. They are all put in chronological order here.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Mr. Davies come to Hollywood to see you relative to the making of *Mission to Moscow* or did you confer with him at any time about it in person?

Mr. WARNER. I conferred with him in Washington and we made the deal in the East, in New York or Washington, I have forgotten which. But he did come here when the film was being produced and he also acted in an advisory capacity throughout the making of the film. As a matter of fact, he appeared in a slight prologue of the picture.

Mr. STRIPLING. Don't you consider very frankly that the film *Mission to Moscow* was in some ways a misinterpretation of the facts of the existing conditions?

Mr. WARNER. Of the time, you mean?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. WARNER. In 1942?

Mr. STRIPLING. In other words, certain historical incidents which were portrayed in the film were not true to fact?

Mr. WARNER. Well, all I could go by—I read the novel and spoke to Mr. Davies on many, many occasions. I had to take his word that they were the facts. He had published the novel and we were criticized severely by the press in New York and elsewhere. As I remember, it was started up by this Professor Dewey from Columbia University. From what I read and heard, he was a Trotskyite and they were the ones who objected mostly to this film because of Lenin versus Trotsky—

Mr. STRIPLING. That is Dr. John Dewey?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. That is what I read. He made statements in the New York Times which were as long as the paper was, but as to the actual facts, if they weren't portrayed authentically—I never was in Russia myself and I don't know what they were doing in 1942, other than seeing the events of the battles for Stalingrad and Moscow, which we all saw in the films and read about. But I talked to Mr. Davies about that after we were criticized, and there is only one thing that happens which is a license, what we call condensation in the making of films. We put the two trials in one and the two trials were condensed because if you ran the two trials it would go on for 20 reels. I personally did not consider that film pro-Communist at the time.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, it is 1947. Do you think it is pro-Communist now?

Mr. WARNER. That I would have to think over. Let me pause for a minute and ask you a question or two, if you don't mind. You mean by saying that the type of scenes shown in that film today would that make the picture pro-Communist, is that it?

Mr. THOMAS. You said in 1942.

Mr. WARNER. It was made in 1942.

Mr. THOMAS. You did not believe it was pro-Communist.

Mr. WARNER. No; we were at war at that time.

Mr. THOMAS. Now, it is 1947. Do you believe it is pro-Communist?

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you release the film now, in other words?

Mr. WARNER. No, we would not release the film now.

Mr. THOMAS. Why not release the film now?

Mr. WARNER. Because of the way Russia is handling their international affairs since the cessation of the war. I consider in my opinion as an American that they are advocating communism throughout the world and I am not in any shape, manner, or form in favor of anything like that. In fact, I despise and detest the very word.

Mr. THOMAS. You say Mr. Davies got in touch with you. He was the first one to get in touch with you about the idea of producing this film, is that correct?

Mr. WARNER. At the time I can't remember if he contacted us, or my brother who was in New York contacted Mr. Davies. I can't say who contacted whom, but I know that we went ahead with it.

Mr. THOMAS. Did any other person in the Government contact either you or your brother in connection with producing Mission to Moscow?

Mr. WARNER. Not to my knowledge, no.

Mr. STRIPLING. What about the State Department?

Mr. WARNER. You mean anyone in the State Department that asked us to make it?

Mr. STRIPLING. Were they consulted in any way in this film, or did they consult with you?

Mr. WARNER. I am trying to think hard who——

Mr. STRIPLING. I am being very frank, Mr. Warner.

Mr. WARNER. If you will give me a couple of minutes.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will be very frank with you. The charge is often made and many statements have been made to the committee to the effect that Mission to Moscow was made at the request of our Government as a so-called appeasement or pap to the Russians; in other words, it was produced at the request of the Government. Now, is such a statement without foundation?

Mr. WARNER. I see what you mean. No, it is not without foundation. That is why I am very happy you put it that way. In order to answer that question correctly, I would say there were rumors and many stories to the effect that if Stalingrad fell Stalin would again join up with Hitler because, naturally, the way the stories were that far back, during the hardest days of the war, from what I could get out of it, is that the authorities in Washington who were conducting the war were afraid if Stalin would take up with Hitler they would destroy the world, not only continental Europe and Russia, but Japan and everything else. And we know what the scheme of things was, that the Japs and Germans were to meet in India or Egypt, I forget just which.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you mean to say some of the Government officials in Washington informed you that they were fearful that Stalin might hook up with Hitler?

Mr. WARNER. No; but that was the tenor of things. It would be pretty hard for me to say that someone told me that, but that was just the general feeling in Washington. Every time I would go there that would be it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Stripling asked a question that I don't think we have had an answer to yet.

Mr. STRIPLING. Let me state further, Mr. Chairman, it has also been charged that this film had the tacit approval, if not the request, of the White House.

Mr. WARNER. Was there anything that occurred prior to the production of this film which led you to believe that the Government, the Federal Government, desired that this film be made as a contribution to the war effort. In other words, what I want to make clear, there is no desire on the part of the subcommittee to put you or your company on the spot for making Mission to Moscow, but if it was made, as in other films, at the request of the Government as a so-called patriotic duty, you would have no other course to follow and you would naturally be expected to do so.

Mr. WARNER. The general feeling as I found it in Washington was a tremendous fear that Stalin might go back with Hitler because he had done it before.

Mr. THOMAS. No. What we want to get at is the reason, not the general feelings.

Mr. WARNER. Yes, but I am just going to come back to that.

Mr. THOMAS. All right.

Mr. WARNER. The Russians were very discouraged and they figured that the United States was not going to back them up with lend-lease and so on and so

forth in sufficient quantities to beat Hitler, which was very, very important to civilization, and the feeling was if a film could be made—and I imagine other things were being done—to assure the Russians and Stalin—

Mr. THOMAS. Can't you be more specific? You say a feeling existed.

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. We want to know more about the specific thing, something more than just a general feeling. We want to know the persons in the Government who got in touch with you concerning the making of this film.

Mr. WARNER. Well, I don't think Mr. Davies was in the Government then. He was then ex-Ambassador to Russia and almost everything was dealt through him.

Mr. THOMAS. Did anyone in the State Department get in touch with you?

Mr. WARNER. No, not directly in touch; no, sir.

Mr. THOMAS. Not directly in touch?

Mr. WARNER. Do you mean did anyone in the White House say we should make the film for reasons along those lines?

Mr. THOMAS. Directly or indirectly.

Mr. WARNER. Well, as I understood at the time through Mr. Davies that he had contacted the White House and for all of the reasons I recited it was good for the defense and for the prosecution of the war to keep the Russians in there fighting until the proper time when the United States and Britain could organize, in other words, give us time to prepare.

Mr. THOMAS. Let's have the date you started producing that film.

Mr. WARNER. We started November 9, 1942.

Mr. THOMAS. And you completed production when?

Mr. WARNER. On February 2, 1943. It took a little under 4 months.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is rather a quick production, isn't it?

Mr. WARNER. No, that was about the usual length of time. They are usually 8 or 10 weeks.

Mr. STRIPLING. From a commercial standpoint the film was not very successful, was it?

Mr. WARNER. No, it was not exceptionally successful. It was not successful to any great degree. It did very good at first.

Mr. STRIPLING. I mean from what I heard. In fact, there has been testimony it was not very successful.

Mr. WARNER. No, I would not call it very successful. Commercially it wasn't exceedingly successful, no, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Warner, there is one question which I think the sub-committee would like to have cleared up and I think that you, as a studio executive, could probably give them some information about it.

Why is it that when you say discharge or dismiss a writer, when you let them go, another studio will employ him?

Mr. WARNER. I was going to say something about that after I recited some of the chronological events of the war in order to confirm my feeling for the reasons that the Government was interested in the making of the picture. This is one of the reasons. I am not here to defend the Government because that is their business.

Mr. THOMAS. We will be glad to have it.

Mr. WARNER. When the Germans were halted at Stalingrad, that was one of the things Mr. Davies told my brother, that it was essential to keep the Russians in there—

Mr. THOMAS. Pitching?

Mr. WARNER. Pitching to give our country a chance to arm—the Navy, the Army, air power, and everything else—which we were not prepared for at the time, and of course history has told the story.

(At this point the chronological chart was copied into the record as follows:)

"Early part of 1942 (chronologically)

"Twenty-six Allies signed war pact.

"Manila fell.

"Japanese air forces raided Australia.

"Russians were defending Crimea * * * and line between Moscow and Leningrad.

"Singapore fell.

"Russians were defending Crimea * * * and line between Moscow and a second front to relieve pressure.

"Thirteen Allied warships lost off Java.

"Java fell.

"Bataan fell.

"General Marshall and Harry Hopkins go to London to discuss possibilities of second front.

"Arrangements completed for getting United States supplies to Russia, which continues on offensive.

"Corregidor fell.

"Battle of Coral Sea.

"Germans regain offensive in Russia.

"Burma fell.

"Germans began move across Africa toward Cairo.

"Arnold in Britain to arrange American bombers to join British as most practical method of helping Russians. Marshall promised second front as soon as feasible.

Starting June 1942 (chronologically)

"Japanese bombed Dutch Harbor and Midway.

"Battle Midway.

"Germans continue offensive deeper into Russia.

"United States-Britain-Russia signed 20-year mutual assistance pact.

"United States agreed on second front this year.

"United States completed lend-lease agreement for Russia.

"Nazis rolled ahead in Africa; captured Tobruk and crossed Egyptian border.

"Russians lost Sevastopol.

"British attacked at El Alamein.

"Germans drive toward Stalingrad in August.

"Russians abandon Krasnodar.

"Nazis drive wedge into Stalingrad line * * * cross Kerch Strait * * * reach Volga, south of Stalingrad * * * capture Novorassisk. Wilkie goes to Russia to see Stalin: asked for immediate second front.

"Stalin asked Allied aid "on time."

"Stalingrad counteroffensive began in November.

"Russian offensive started all along the line in December."

MR. STRIPLING. If you had not been approached by Mr. Davies or by anyone in the Government indirectly it would have been very likely that you would not have filmed *Mission to Moscow*.

MR. WARNER. No; we would not.

MR. STRIPLING. I think the writers are the most important people in this investigation. I believe you mentioned Koch.

MR. WARNER. Howard Koch.

MR. STRIPLING. That you dismissed him and he was later picked up by Samuel Goldwyn.

MR. WARNER. I understand he is now working for him.

MR. STRIPLING. Why, in your opinion, did Mr. Goldwyn, or, say, any other studio—why should they pick up a writer like that?

MR. WARNER. Here is where I think I can be of immeasurable good, in my next statement, aside from everything else I am trying to do for the good of my country. I have talked to other producers as an American and not in the line of my duty of doing business or running a studio at all. Just why these men engage these people when they know their tendencies, especially the ones who are actually proven Communists, and why they have carried them all these years. I even went so far as to tell them: If you go through the records of the scripts that the men have been assigned to, you will find that very few of their works have been produced. In each case, I either got a blank stare in return or "If we didn't hire them, someone else would." That is about as plain as I can put it.

MR. STRIPLING. Isn't that a very unhealthy situation for the industry?

MR. WARNER. Yes; it is exceedingly unhealthy. And I think in my opinion it is very un-American if everything that can be proven against these people is proven. Naturally, these commies and lefties and what not, the party-line followers—no one has proven anything against them in print other than being investigated.

MR. STRIPLING. But you do know they try to inject these lines into your scripts, as you found out.

MR. WARNER. I personally know that, and I think everybody else knows they try to do it in the studios. No one is cheating anyone. They do it in a humorous vein.

Mr. THOMAS. Not only humorous.

Mr. WARNER. Well, strike the word "humorous." I stand corrected.

Mr. THOMAS. You might say in an insidious vein.

Mr. WARNER. Yes; insidions.

Mr. THOMAS. We can't understand, if you have talked to the other producers, why they don't do something.

Mr. WARNER. I talked to them individually.

Mr. THOMAS. All right, individually. They probably consciously or unconsciously agree with you, but just give you a blank stare, as you say. But we want to know what you can do about it. How will you correct the situation?

Mr. WARNER. As I said, I have gone out whole hog to try to get these people to do something about it. I can't understand why people engage them.

Mr. THOMAS. That is what we would like to know.

Mr. WARNER. I can't fathom it, to save my life.

Mr. THOMAS. But we want to know how you are going to correct the situation. Do you think they will keep on engaging them and keep on doing this until, the first thing you know, the industry gets a black eye, or will they ultimately get religion as you have got religion?

Mr. WARNER. I would like to correct that statement. I didn't get religion. I have always been that way—an American.

Mr. THOMAS. I didn't mean that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Become aware of it.

Mr. THOMAS. By religion I meant you have become aware of the danger.

Mr. WARNER. Of the danger; that is correct.

Mr. THOMAS. Will they become aware or not become aware and the industry get a black eye?

Mr. WARNER. I can say this for the industry: They are all good Americans, but some of them look upon this type of man drawing a big salary as being a good, capable writer and see no reason why he should not keep on working, because there is no law against it.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, there is no law against it, but I want to tell you if I had a business it would not make any difference—whether it is the insurance business which I have got—or whether it was the moving picture business or some other business—if I had a business I would not keep a commie in there 5 seconds.

Mr. WARNER. That is my policy and my brother's policy.

Mr. THOMAS. You have done the same thing.

Mr. WARNER. Definitely.

Mr. THOMAS. But the dollar sign plays a big part with some of the other fellows, and that is what astounds us.

Mr. WARNER. I would like to make a brief statement outlining the policy of the company and ourselves personally regarding subversive elements such as leftists, fellow travelers, or members of the Communist Party. I wish to reiterate the very tenor of Congressman Thomas' feeling as just stated because I could not improve on it. I also want to offer as evidence, if you will accept it, two of our personnel blanks that have been in use for a number of years. This yellow application form was first used in 1936. I would like to have you look at question No. 10. And on the white form, page 3, question No. 17, where we deliberately put in there through my personal direction—I would like you to read it [handing documents to Mr. Stripling].

Mr. STRIPLING. I will read it into the record.

Question No. 10. "Are you affiliated with any organization or group that is antagonistic to the principles of our American form of government?"

That is on the yellow form.

Now, the white form, question No. 17:

"Are you affiliated with any organization or group antagonistic to the principles of our American form of government? (Yes or no)—. Are you a member of any organization, society, group, or sect owing allegiance to a foreign government or rule? (Yes or no)—."

Mr. WARNER. We had plenty of rebuffs from people who had to answer them or they wouldn't get a job.

(The afore-mentioned documents were marked "Warner Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," respectively.)⁷

Mr. STRIPLING. Don't you think the most effective way of removing these Communist influences—and I say Communist influences; I am not saying Com-

⁷ See appendix, p. 523, for Warner exhibits 1 and 2, submitted in executive hearings, May 15, 1947, now designated as exhibits 9 and 10.

munists; I am not accusing them all of being Communists—but don't you think the most effective way is the pay-roll route? In other words, if the owners and producers cut these people off the pay roll it would eliminate it much quicker than a congressional committee or crusades and so forth.

Mr. WARNER. Well, that definitely would be. Of course, if you drop them out of pictures then the Communists have other ways of doing it. In New York I saw *All of My Sons*, written by Arthur Miller. Here are some of the lines: "Rich men are made ambassadors. Poor men are strung up by the thumbs."

Another line: "You can't walk along the street and spit unless you hit a college man."

They write about 21 cylinder heads that were broken. They can't write about the 1,500,000 good airplane motors produced. These are the kind of things they write about. That play disgusted me. I almost got into a fist fight in the lobby.

I said, "How dare they?" They wrote about 21 little cylinder heads that were cracked. And the play is a good play, but it has all of this stuff in it. In fact, it won the critics' award in New York, and was directed by a chap named Elia Kazan who is now at Twentieth Century-Fox as a director. He directed *Boomerang* and is now going somewhere to make a picture for them.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the new one?

Mr. WARNER. Gentlemen's Agreement. Can I say something off the record?

Mr. THOMAS. Put it on the record.

Mr. WARNER. This fellow is also one of the mob. I know of him. I pass him by but won't talk to him.

Mr. STRIPLING. Doesn't it kind of provoke you to pay them \$1,000 or \$2,000 a week and see them on the picket lines and joining all of these organizations and taking your money and trying to tear down a system that provides the money?

Mr. WARNER. That is absolutely correct because I will offer as evidence John Howard Lawson—a photograph of him in our picket line in the big strike of 1945. The strike was supposedly on account of the carpenters and painters.

Have you got it? I haven't seen it for a long time.

(Mr. Matthews hands photograph to Mr. Warner.)

Mr. WARNER. I have never seen this fellow in person, but here he is. In that line was John Wexley to whom I called your attention before. There were loads of them—Ring Lardner, Jr. They even went so far as to send me a threatening telegram which I am sorry I didn't bring with me—that we were using goons to destroy union labor. They are the ones that came through with goons from Chicago and overturned our motorcars. We have motion pictures of it. It is nauseating to see it.

(The photograph referred to by Mr. Warner was marked "Warner Exhibit No. 3.")⁸

Mr. STRIPLING. About that time what were you paying Mr. Lawson and some of these other writers?

Mr. WARNER. We were probably giving them about \$750.

Mr. THOMAS. \$750 a week?

Mr. WARNER. Yes. He was there only for that one picture. Here is the way the fellows get into the studios, in my opinion. In each studio there is what they call a steerer. Most of them are members of the story editors and writing departments and they bring in all these boys. I tried to find out how they got in our place. There was a very inoffensive, nice chap—a very nice guy all around—his name is James Goller. I don't know if he belongs to anything, but he must be something on the left side of the street. He is the one that steered most of these writers into the studio. He was in charge of picking up writers.

Mr. THOMAS. Is he still employed by you?

Mr. WARNER. No. He went the moment his contract was out and we could legally get rid of him. He has been gone at least for some time. They are all gone. The last one that left us was Gordon Kahn.

Mr. STRIPLING. Your eyes have really been opened, Mr. Warner.

Mr. WARNER. They were open all the time. I always had my eyes open. I don't mean to say that I didn't but I didn't realize what method they were using. I always looked upon the Communists as overthrowing the Government by violence and force. I believe that is the very words that they state.

Mr. STRIPLING. I think that is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WARNER. Let me see what else I may have here. There are many ways of going against the capitalist system using one form or another, such as poking

⁸ See appendix, p. 523, for Warner Exhibit No. 3, submitted in executive hearing, May 15, 1947, now designated as exhibit 11.

fun at our political system. This seems to be the easiest way for writers to get by us, and by the production heads. The rich man is their favorite choice.

Now, I have something on the back here. After this big strike these people were naturally of the opinion that we were sympathetic with them, which we were to labor in general. Laborers were trying to live on \$18 a week in the depression period and my brother and I deliberately raised the wage scale from around 50 or 60 cents, whatever it was, to 85 cents, and we were rather criticized by people around here. When the strike started they picked on us first, thinking that we were with them. They instantly found out we were not with them; it was just to the contrary. When asked why they picked on Warner Bros., they said they figured, being our friends, we would succumb immediately and sign the new contract. This was a jurisdictional strike—not for wages. They are still striking to this day. When they found out about us, they got off of us rapidly and they don't like us any more.

Mr. THOMAS. I have one more question. You saw an Associated Press dispatch that appeared in the newspapers a few days ago, in fact, on May 12. It was a statement made by the interpreter Yuri Zhukov in which he stated that the United States films smelled a mile of propaganda. This is his exact statement. He said that "American producers were cooperating with the State Department and monopoly capital to glut the world market with films giving a distorted, sweetened picture of life in the United States."

Why do you thing Mr. Zhukov made that statement? That was just a few days ago. You probably read it.

Mr. WARNER. Yes; I did read that statement. Well, I think that they really believe it. They believe that through our pictures we are trying to sell the American doctrine.

Mr. THOMAS. Or was it to head off a new flood of pictures that the producers may be considering putting out that might be anti-Communist films?

Mr. WARNER. It could be that. I am sure the Russian propagandists need no aid from anyone. They are pretty clever. They know everything.

Mr. THOMAS. Isn't it true there will be a rush of anti-Communist films?

Mr. WARNER. I don't think there will be a rush of them, but there are going to be a few made because we are making one now, 'Up Until Now. We sent a company to Boston to get proper locations. In making this type of film you have to be certain you are portraying the events of the day. You can't say that you are going to make Mission to Moscow in 1947 because 1942 was an entirely different story. Then they were our allies and when you are fighting your enemy you go along with your allies until you win.

Yes; I feel you have proven a point, in my opinion. Propagandawise they contemplate many anti-Communist pictures and I don't believe there will be so many made. The only one I know going right out to tell the story is the one we are preparing. The rest of them are doing it in one form or another. I don't say anyone will make any pro-Russian pictures, because that is ridiculous. They will try to make good American stories. There have been some very, very wonderful sequences and American speeches made by the companies in the past. I don't think there is anyone who hasn't tried in one form or another to do that, but every once in a while they will get this anticapitalistic propaganda, as I have found it, and some of it may stick in the films. They have gotten things over on me; I know they have.

Mr. THOMAS. Have you any more questions?

Mr. STRIPLING. I have no more questions.

Mr. McDOWELL. I have none.

Mr. WARNER. If you don't mind just a moment. Would you want this for the record? You can use it as you wish. These are copies of Communist literature distributed on our picket lines in the 1945 strike.

Mr. THOMAS. We would like very much to have them.

Mr. WARNER. We have books that high of evidence that went on in front of the studio, but everybody knows about this.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will ask the reporter to mark those exhibits at this point in the record.

(The leaflets referred to were marked "Warner's Exhibits 4, 5, and 6.")⁹

Mr. WARNER. Screening pictures for subversive messages—that is the cardinal point. We watch everything. One fellow came up and objected and found fault with the destruction of the Indians and what not in order for the white

⁹ See appendix, p. 523, for Warner Exhibits Nos. 4, 5, and 6, introduced in executive hearing, May 15, 1947, now designated as exhibits 12, 13, and 14.

men to build a railroad out West. Whether it is true or false I don't know. I really don't know because I wasn't there. He said, "There is no reason why we can't do that because it is in the school books. They have been writing about it for almost 100 years and it is a fact." Then he recited a picture that we made about the railroad barons, or whatever you want to call them in the East, a picture called *Saratoga Trunk*, directed by Sam Wood, a very fine man. If you saw that film you will remember Gary Cooper and Ingrid Bergman. It came out a couple of years ago. The men were trying to steal railroads from one another. I don't know, they called them robber barons or something of that nature. They come back with those kinds of things, "You permitted it in *Saratoga Trunk* and you don't let it go here. That is the way I feel about it. This is really not about Indians. It is really about the building of the West." They have the routine of the Indians and the colored folks. That is always their set-up.

Mr. THOMAS. The committee appreciates your coming here, Mr. Warner. You are doing a splendid job. We only wish that it could be carried through into some of the other companies. If at any time you have any ideas as to how you can work out the situation with the other producers in order to accomplish just what you have been doing I think it would be helpful to the country. The main thing I want to say right now is we certainly appreciate your coming here today and giving us your cooperation. What you said has been very helpful to the committee. This is off the record.

Mr. WARNER. May I give you a couple of more things in case you want to use them?

Mr. THOMAS. Go right ahead.

Mr. WARNER. It is often difficult to prevent the hiring of certain people due to the fact the majority of employees are hired through unions and through the guilds, some of which are Communist-controlled. Also the discharging of subversive employees is difficult because of union regulations. We have to do it along seniority lines. One of the guilds was pretty pink and we had to close a complete department in order to get rid of them. The *Story Analysts* was the name of it. We had to close the whole thing and do it in New York, which I did.

We established some time ago a unit to investigate these things and this type of work in the studio.

Mr. THOMAS. Is there anything in your testimony which you have given here today that you are willing for us to give out to the press?

Mr. WARNER. Let me tell you two more things, about the *Bulletin* which we have here, and I would like to submit a photostatic copy of an open letter to Jack Warner, dated October 23, 1945, printed in the *New Masses*.

Mr. THOMAS. That will be the next exhibit.

(The open letter was marked "Warner's Exhibit No. 7.") ¹⁰

Mr. MATTHEWS. We have some bulletins issued by the IATSE.

(The bulletins referred to dated November 2 and 13, 1945, were marked "Warner's Exhibits 8 and 9," respectively.) ¹¹

Mr. THOMAS. Now, is there anything which you have given us that you would like for us to say to the press?

Mr. WARNER. There is one thing that is very important, something I would not like to give to the press; let's put it that way.

Mr. THOMAS. What is that?

Mr. WARNER. That is the whole routine on *Mission to Moscow*.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the one thing you don't want to give to the press?

Mr. WARNER. That is the one thing I don't want to give to the press because that is like throwing the hammer and sickle up in front of you, and it all happened back in 1942.

Mr. THOMAS. That is all.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. I would like to get one or two specific answers from Mr. Warner.

Touching again upon the association, you are a very responsible executive in the motion-picture industry, Mr. Warner. You are thrown

¹⁰ See appendix, p. 523, for exhibit 15.

¹¹ See appendix, p. 523, for exhibits 16 and 17.

into an association, in this organization, with other executives of the industry.

Now, we have touched upon the writers that were dismissed. But we all have knowledge of a large number of actors who are generally known to have communistic sympathies and are contributors to the Communist war chest. It would seem to me that your organization would recognize the fact that the American people are not interested in viewing the pictures in which actors appear who have communistic leanings. It would seem to me that this organization should concern itself with cleaning house in its own industry.

You pointed out what the organization was not organized for, but you didn't touch upon the reason, the actual reason or reasons, for its existence. I take it for granted that the reason is the betterment and the improvement of the industry. I don't think that you can improve the industry to any greater degree and in any better direction than through the elimination of the writers and the actors to whom definite communistic leanings can be traced.

Don't you agree to that, Mr. Warner?

MR. WARNER. I agree to it personally, Mr. Congressman, but I cannot agree as far as the association is concerned. I can't, for the life of me, figure where men could get together and try in any form, shape, or manner to deprive a man of a livelihood because of his political beliefs.

It would be a conspiracy, the attorney tells me, and I know that myself.

MR. VAIL. At this stage we have no law. There is a question as to whether we shall have a law to illegalize (sic) communism. But we have to recognize that the motion-picture industry is one of the channels through which is established the groundwork for the eventual destruction by force, that you spoke of a little while ago.

Don't you think it is a job of the industry, then, to prevent the insertion of the tentacles of the communistic ideology through your industry?

MR. WARNER. Speaking as an individual American, with each man in the industry having a responsibility, I feel like you do. I feel, likewise, in the free press, the radio, and the theater to a degree more or less, that everybody is very, very cognizant of the duty that they are entrusted with, in the dissemination of the American way of life.

Speaking for myself, as I have testified many times here, I am more than aware of it, and I do everything that is humanly possible to eradicate it in every form, shape, or manner. That could be my only answer. The producers' association has nothing to do with a man's ability to earn a living, and so forth. We meet in common purpose for the betterment of moral standards of our business—sort of good public relations, I would call it.

MR. VAIL. Well, you recognize the fact that communism is a very definite threat to our Government today?

MR. WARNER. I certainly do recognize it—a threat not only to the United States but to many of the European and the far-eastern countries.

MR. VAIL. Well, you recognize the fact, also, that the motion-picture industry, paying high salaries to actors professing communism and

supporting the Communist Party, is lending aid and support to the communistic effort?

Mr. WARNER. If you have that proof, undoubtedly that is what they are doing. I don't know whether they are doing it or not.

Mr. VAIL. I feel that you are much better informed than I am about the situation out in Hollywood. I assume that while you may not know, you probably have heard rumors—like all the rest of us have heard rumors—that certain actors and actresses, as well as writers, are substantial contributors to the Communist Party.

Mr. WARNER. I have heard rumors. It is sort of common gossip, for the want of something else to speak about.

Mr. VAIL. Well, you have failed to act for lack of supporting proof. Would you act if proof were supplied?

Mr. WARNER. We would act very effectively if we had the proof.

Mr. VAIL. Thank you, Mr. Warner.

Mr. WARNER. You are welcome.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to announce that it is going to be the policy of the committee to go into session every morning at 10:30, to recess at 12:30, to reconvene at 2, and to adjourn at 4.

The witnesses scheduled for tomorrow—and we will have two more witnesses this afternoon—will be, first, Mr. Adolphe Menjou; second, Mr. Jack Moffitt; and, third, Ayn Rand.

Mr. Warner, the committee desires to thank you very much for being here today and speaking so freely and for doing the excellent job which you have done in your own studio in cleaning house.

Thank you.¹²

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:30, a recess was taken until 2 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. The first witness, Mr. Chairman, is Sam Wood.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. WOOD. I do, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF SAMUEL GROSVENOR WOOD

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Wood, will you please state your full name?

Mr. WOOD. Samuel Grosvenor Wood.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

¹² See appendix, p. 524, for subpoena of Jack L. Warner, being exhibit 18.

Mr. WOOD. I am a motion-picture producer and director.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. WOOD. I was born in Philadelphia, Pa., 1883.

The CHAIRMAN. Excuse me, Mr. Stripling.

Haven't you an attorney?

Mr. WOOD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you desire an attorney?

Mr. WOOD. No. I am certainly satisfied.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been associated with the motion picture industry, Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. For over 30 years.

Mr. STRIPLING. What are the various positions that you have held in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. WOOD. Pardon me?

Mr. STRIPLING. The various positions you have held. You have been producer, director—

Mr. WOOD. I was first assistant director for a year and a half and then became a director; then I produced and directed my own pictures.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you name to the committee some of the films which you have produced and directed in recent years?

Mr. WOOD. Well, Saratoga Trunk, Goodbye Mr. Chips, For Whom the Bell Tolls, Kitty Foyle, King's Row; the last picture was Ivy, with Joan Fontaine.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Directors Guild?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you explain to the committee what the Screen Directors Guild is?

Mr. WOOD. Well, it is very similar to a union. I mean, we have banded together to protect our rights and have a uniform front on subjects that might come up with the executives or the studios.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know how many members the Screen Directors Guild has?

Mr. WOOD. I think we have two hundred and forty-some. I am not sure of that, but I think that is it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not the Screen Directors Guild has ever been infiltrated by the Communists?

Mr. WOOD. They have tried.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you tell the committee of the efforts that you are aware of on the part of the Communists to infiltrate the Screen Directors Guild?

Mr. WOOD. There is a constant effort to get control of the guild. In fact, there is an effort to get control of all unions and guilds in Hollywood. I think our most serious time was when George Stevens was president; he went in the service and another gentleman took his place, who died, and it was turned over to John Cromwell. Cromwell, with the assistance of three or four others, tried hard to steer us into the Red river, but we had a little too much weight for that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you name the others?

Mr. WOOD. Irving Pichel, Edward Dmytryk, Frank Tuttle, and—I am sorry, there is another name there. I forget.

Mr. STRIPLING. If you think of it, will you give it for the record?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Wood, are you a member of the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals?

Mr. WOOD. I am. I was the first president.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you tell the committee the circumstances under which this organization was founded, and the reason why it was founded?

Mr. WOOD. Well, the reason was very simple. We organized in self-defense. We felt that there was a definite effort by the Communist Party members, or Party travelers, to take over the unions and the guilds of Hollywood, and if they had the unions and guilds controlled, they would have the plum in their lap and they would move on to use it for Communist propaganda.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall the year that the alliance was established?

Mr. WOOD. 1944.

Mr. STRIPLING. I have here a copy of the statement of principles of the guild.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Without reading them into the record, could you briefly outline to the committee the purposes? I will hand you this.

Mr. WOOD. I am sorry, I don't have my glasses. I was going to ask you to read it for me.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

We believe in, and like, the American way of life; the liberty and freedom which generations before us have fought to create and preserve; the freedom to speak, to think, to live, to worship, to work, and to govern ourselves as individuals, as free men; the right to succeed or fail as free men, according to the measure of our ability and our strength.

Believing in these things, we find ourselves in sharp revolt against a rising tide of communism, fascism, and kindred beliefs, that seek by subversive means to undermine and change this way of life; groups that have forfeited their right to exist in this country of ours, because they seek to achieve their change by means other than the vested procedure of the ballot and to deny the right of the majority opinion of the people to rule.

In our special field of motion pictures, we resent the growing impression that this industry is made up of, and dominated by, Communists, radicals, and crackpots. We believe that we represent the vast majority of the people who serve this great medium of expression. But unfortunately it has been an unorganized majority. This has been almost inevitable. The very love of freedom, of the rights of the individual, make this great majority reluctant to organize. But now we must, or we shall meanly lose "the last, best hope on earth."

As Americans, we have no new plan to offer. We want no new plan, we want only to defend against its enemies that which is our priceless heritage: that freedom which has given man, in this country, the fullest life and the richest expression the world has ever known: that system which, in the present emergency, has fathered an effort that, more than any other single factor, will make possible the winning of this war.

As members of the motion-picture industry, we must face and accept an especial responsibility. Motion pictures are inescapably one of the world's greatest forces for influencing public thought and opinion, both at home and abroad. In this fact lies solemn obligation. We refuse to permit the effort of Communist, Fascist, and other totalitarian-minded groups to pervert this powerful medium into an instrument for the dissemination of un-American ideas and beliefs. We pledge ourselves to fight, with every means at our organized command, any effort of any group or individual, to divert the loyalty of the screen from the free America that gave it birth. And to dedicate our work, in the fullest possible measure, to the presentation of the American scene, its standards and its freedoms, its beliefs and its ideals, as we know them and believe in them.

Mr. Wood, would you name some of the other individuals in Hollywood who were associated with you in the formation of this organization?

Mr. WOOD. Maurice Riskin, Gary Cooper, Clark Gable, Bob Taylor, Jim McGuinness, Howard Emmett Rogers, Ralph Clair, Ben Martinez, Joe Touhy. Those last three men are labor leaders. When we first incorporated, I think we had 50 to 100 people together to talk this over, and then we decided to organize. It is difficult to remember all the names. I don't know whether that is enough. Oh, there is Ginger Rogers.

Mr. STRIPLING. Victor Fleming?

Mr. WOOD. Victor Fleming. Clarence Brown.

Mr. STRIPLING. Rupert Hughes?

Mr. WOOD. Rupert Hughes.

Mr. STRIPLING. They were people who were very prominent in the industry?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; very prominent.

Mr. STRIPLING. The reason for forming this organization was to combat the inroads that the Communists were making or attempting to make within the industry?

Mr. WOOD. Both the Communists and the Fascists.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did your organization meet with any opposition?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; great deal of it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you describe for the committee the attack that was made upon the organization and upon the individuals who were instrumental in founding it?

Mr. WOOD. Well, an organization was gotten together called the Emergency Council of Hollywood Guilds and Unions over which Emmett Lavery presided and back of the scenes was Herbert Sorrell. Then there was an organization which jumped up called the Free Word. Walter Wanger dug it up some place. I think it has quite a background, if you want to look it up. Wanger's first attack was on the basis of "We don't want any home-front Communists here." He didn't mention any home-front Fascists. He called it "home-front Fascists," but said nothing about "home-front Communists." The other attacks were individual. We know of a number of people that called up other people. It just depended on which method they thought would be the most effective. And they referred to us as anti-Semitic, anti-labor, anti-Negro. Of course, always anti-labor when they couldn't think of anything else.

Mr. STRIPLING. Isn't that the usual tactics of the Communist?

Mr. WOOD. To smear, yes. Smear and hide.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Wood, is it your opinion that the Communists do exercise some degree of influence in the making and production of motion pictures in Hollywood at the present time, or have in the past?

Mr. WOOD. Well, at the present time—of course, they are always trying—but I think at the present time Hollywood is pretty well aware of them and I think the thing is watched pretty closely. It has really caused everyone to be a watch dog. They know pretty well. I think it was inexperience that any material crept through. Now that they are aware of it they kept a pretty good eye on them.

It isn't only what they get in the films, it is what they keep out. If a story has a good point, that sells the American way of living, that

can be eliminated and you wouldn't miss it. If you picture some official, or the banker, as a dirty "so and so," we can see that, and out it goes. Of course, they know me pretty well. In fact, I don't have any of them around. I don't want them.

Mr. STRIPLING. You haven't had any trouble with any of the Communists in your own productions?

Mr. Wood. No.

Mr. STRIPLING. Why do you think that is?

Mr. Wood. Because I don't have them. Don't want them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that true of all the studios in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. Wood. I know the heads of most of the studios. I know Louis Mayer, Mrs. Schenk, Eddie Manix, I know the Warners, Mr. Friedman, Mr. Ginsburg of Paramount, Mr. Yates of Republic. I could go on down the line. I don't think any of them would willingly permit propaganda, Communist propaganda, in their pictures. But it is impossible, utterly impossible for the heads of the studios to read the number of scripts they would have to read. There is the danger. They are always trying. So you have to be a watchdog.

Mr. STRIPLING. What group in the industry must be watched more carefully than the rest?

Mr. Wood. The writers.

Mr. STRIPLING. The writers?

Mr. Wood. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is it your opinion that there are Communist writers in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. Wood. Oh, yes. It is not my opinion, I know positively there are.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you care to name any that you know yourself to be Communists?

Mr. Wood. Well, I don't think there is any question about Dalton Trumbo; any question about Donald Ogden Stewart. The reporter asked the question of a great many writers, "Are you a member of the Communist Party," or "Are you a Communist?"

Mr. STRIPLING. Did they deny it?

Mr. Wood. They didn't answer it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was John Howard Lawson one of those persons?

Mr. Wood. Oh, yes; he is active in every piece of Communist work going on.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is there any question in your mind that John Howard Lawson is a Communist?

Mr. Wood. If there is, then I haven't any mind.

I suppose there are 19 gentlemen back there that say I haven't.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did you first notice this effort on the part of the Communists to enter Hollywood or to exert influence in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. Wood. Well, I think they really started working around 1930, some, I forget the exact time. I think we were very conscious of it, had been for some time, but like everyone else we probably hadn't done anything, because it is quite an effort and you get quite smeared, and a lot of people would like to duck that. It is fun to play bridge, for instance, rather than to check on something like that. We felt it more, I think, just previously to our organization in 1944.

Mr. STRIPLING. That was the reason, in other words, that you formed your organization, was to combat the increased activity on the part of the Communists in the industry?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir; we felt there was a great danger, and it was in the interest of self-defense of our business, because we felt a moral responsibility for our business. It has been very kind to a lot of us, and we want to protect it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Wood, would you give the committee some of these examples in which the Communists have exerted influence in the motion-picture industry? In other words, how do they go about it, what is the mechanics of it?

Mr. WOOD. There are a number of ways. I think the thing that is very important, and the thing I was most anxious about, is the pride of Americans in working. They are pretty subtle. For instance, a man gets a key position in the studio and has charge of the writers. When you, as a director or a producer, are ready for a writer you ask for a list and this man shows you a list. Well, if he is following the party line his pets are on top or the other people aren't on at all. If there is a particular man in there that has been opposing them they will leave his name off the list. Then if that man isn't employed for about 2 months they go to the head of the studio and say, "Nobody wants this man." The head is perfectly honest about it and says, "Nobody wants to use him, let him go." So a good American is let out. But it doesn't stop there. They point that out as an example and say, "You better fall in line, play ball, or else." And they go down the line on it.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is true in the case of writers. Would you say it is true in any other branch of the industry?

Mr. WOOD. I don't think, in any part of the business, they will use a party who is opposed to their ideas, if they can avoid it, and they can usually avoid it.

Mr. STRIPLING. They operate as cliques, in other words?

Mr. WOOD. Oh, yes; they have their meetings every night. They are together; they work for one purpose.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is that purpose, Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. Well, I think they are agents of a foreign country myself.

Mr. STRIPLING. I see.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that these persons you named here today were agents of a foreign country?

Mr. WOOD. I think anyone following the party line, I think this particular party line, are agents of a foreign country. I think they are directed from a foreign country.

It isn't exactly fair to have my back to that gang out there.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Wood, from time to time have pictures been produced by Hollywood which portray what we might call the sordid side of American life? Are you familiar with any pictures of that kind?

Mr. WOOD. Well, I think there are all sides of life and I think they should be photographed. I would like to say that I think one of the great dangers to this business would be censorship because those people are so well organized that they would like to have censorship because then they would get their stooges in the position of censoring and then would have it in their pocket. And as far as the sordid side

is concerned, I think you should tell all things in pictures. I think that if a story has a good point to it—I mean, *Grapes of Wrath*—things happen in America and I think we should show it.

Mr. STRIPLING. I believe Mr. Johnston, when he appeared before the committee, made some mention of Russia's desire to obtain certain pictures which might portray the worst side of the United States. Do you know of any pictures that they have endeavored to obtain to show in Russia?

Mr. WOOD. I don't know as they would be anxious to show that picture, because, after all, as poor as they were, they did have a piece of ground, and they did have an automobile, and they are at liberty to get the automobile and travel across the country.

Mr. STRIPLING. Speaking of *Grapes of Wrath*?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; I don't think he would be anxious to show that. He might have started it, but I think they would take it off if they did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Wood, since so many Americans attend the motion pictures every week, you are certainly aware of the tremendous propaganda vehicle it affords. Do you feel that the Communists have succeeded in putting in pictures scenes which—or leaving scenes out of pictures—which indirectly attack our system of government?

Mr. WOOD. Well, unquestionably they are always trying. It is very difficult for the American people to understand what you mean by Communist propaganda in pictures. You might refer to some picture, something is mentioned, and they say, "That is ridiculous, there is no propaganda there," because they are looking for some howl for Stalin or showing the Russian way of life. But they don't show that. They have nothing to sell. All they want to do is try to unsell America.

Mr. STRIPLING. That can be done just as effectively by leaving stuff out of pictures as by putting it in?

Mr. WOOD. Yes; they don't want to show the American way of life.

Mr. STRIPLING. These groups or cliques that you have referred to in the motion-picture industry, are they a source of financial assistance to the Community Party in California?

Mr. WOOD. Very substantial. For example, at the rally which Katherine Kepburn attended, they raised \$87,000—and you know that didn't go to the Boy Scouts.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where do you think it went?

Mr. WOOD. We will see the results of it. Recently they had a rally for these 19 guests of yours and they raised \$10,000. They dig the money up, or else.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you ever approached by any Government representative, Mr. Wood, regarding the making of a film dealing with the Congress of the United States?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you tell the committee the circumstances of that?

Mr. WOOD. I got a phone call from Sam Spivak in New York, I think he was, or Washington, saying there was a very important picture they wanted made, and particularly wanted me to make it, because it had to be so and so. I was delighted to make anything that

would help the war effort. I said all right. They said the gentleman would be out tomorrow. The next day I got a call from Lowell Mellett. I met him at the Brown Derby in Beverly Hills and he had with him a man named Pointer. They told me they wanted to make a short showing Congress enacting a law. It was a little strange to me, because I couldn't figure how that was going to help the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't get the name of the picture.

Mr. WOOD. A short showing the Congress enacting a law. And when they told me what the subject was, I said, I was a little surprised and then they immediately started to refer to "Joe"—different Members of the Congress, referred to them by their first names. They were a little amused about the gentleman "Joe." In the meantime I thought it over and I said, "How is that going to help the war effort?" and they looked at me a little strangely, and in a few minutes the thing was over, and I didn't hear any more of it. So maybe I spoke too quickly.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you gain the impression that they thought it ridiculed Congress?

Mr. WOOD. I had an idea from the conversation that they didn't think highly of them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether Mr. Mellett was a representative then of the Motion Picture Section of the Office of War Information?

Mr. WOOD. I don't know positively. I presume he was. Spivak told me these gentlemen were coming out and I presume they were conducted with them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee whether or not in the past there have been efforts to discredit certain institutions of the American Government by constantly referring to the Members of Congress as being crooks, and so forth, in the pictures?

Mr. WOOD. I think there has been an effort. Of course, if you go back in pictures you will find frequently the banker or the man in public life, the doctor, any one of them would be the heavy in the picture. I think it is particularly bad if that is constantly shown, every night you go to the pictures you see a dishonest banker, or Senator, you begin to think that the whole system is wrong. That is the way they work on it. They figure if you can break down or destroy the confidence of the people in the Government, or the gentlemen who are executing it, then it is a very simple thing to have a new idea for them—and, believe me, they have got one for you, too.

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood, do you have any questions?

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. Mr. Wood, how many people are members of the Writers Guild?

Mr. WOOD. I think, sir, about eleven or twelve hundred members.

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. This other organization; what was that?

Mr. WOOD. Motion Picture Alliance?

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. Yes. How many members are there of that?

Mr. WOOD. Well, we have probably 1,100 members, but then we have the heads of labor and they control a great many votes. We have a lot of people, thousands more of people, who are indirectly interested with us through other associations.

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. What percentage of the membership of those organizations would you say now follow the Communist line?

Mr. WOOD. I think you misunderstood. I said that the Motion Picture Writers Guild was controlled by the Communists but they are a very small portion of them.

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. How do they control it?

Mr. WOOD. Well, sir, how do they control labor? After all, there are a lot of ways they do it. They call a meeting, they start arguments, it gets to be around 12 o'clock and they are still going, the people go home, and then they pass what they want to pass. They have got that down pretty cleverly. Of course, they like to put up people who are not members of the Communist Party. It is much more favorable to them to have a man who is a good Catholic, for instance, stand up and say, "I am not a Communist," but he is talking for them.

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. You say you have been in the producing business how long?

Mr. WOOD. I have been in the motion-picture directing and producing end for over 30 years.

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. During that time you directed pictures for various studios?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir; I started in with Paramount and then went to Metro. I think I was with those two for 20 years. Then I went on my own. I mean, I didn't go directly to that. I have made pictures—if I liked the story I have made a picture. For instance, I wanted to get Gary Cooper for *For Whom the Bell Tolls* and Goldwyn would only let me have him if I made *Lou Gehrig*. But I have been producing my own pictures for the last 3 or 4 years.

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. I would like to have your opinion as to the views on communism or other subversive influences embraced by any responsible studio head or producer for whom you have worked or by whom you have been employed.

Mr. WOOD. I have never come in contact with any heads of any studios that were Communist inclined or favored it or weren't willing to fight against it. For instance, in our own country we weren't very conscious of it until very recently. I think now you can depend on them. They will take as strong action as the Government or we will take with them. I am positive of that, of the men I know.

Mr. JOHN S. WOOD. I believe that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Wood, you have indicated that the organization which you have described believes that it is essential for Hollywood to direct its attack against both the Fascists on the one side and the Communists on the other?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIXON. And you have indicated that when your organization was formed there were certain elements in Hollywood which leveled some pretty severe attacks upon your organization and that those attacks were limited to that part of your program that had to do with anti-Communist activities?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir. None of them referred to us as Communists at all. It was sort of a mouth-to-mouth thing. They would call up. For instance, Jewish members, they even called them anti-Semitic. Labor people were antilabor. It didn't make any difference. But they kept it up. You can't stop that.

Mr. NIXON. The grounds which generally have been given by those who dislike any criticism of Hollywood following an anti-Communist line, shall we say, or any criticism of the pictures which have, shall we say, been pro-Communist, is that they do not feel that propaganda and the motion pictures should be controlled and they do not feel that it should be used for the purpose of attacking any way of thinking. You, of course, have heard of the control arguments which have been used time and time again.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir; I saw a copy of that meeting.

Mr. NIXON. This group obviously, therefore, has said we don't want to see any investigations of Communist activities in Hollywood, we don't want to see any pictures which are anti-Communist, or any influence exerted to make anti-Communist pictures, because if that is the case we would be leveling an attack upon the right of people to believe anything they want in the United States and to say it openly. But by the same token have any members of those groups ever criticized you, or to your knowledge have they ever criticized any segment of the industry for the pictures which Hollywood has made in which Hollywood has leveled a devastating attack on the totalitarian form of government?

Mr. WOOD. Well, that is a long question. Do you want me to take it by sections?

Mr. NIXON. Have you any knowledge that this group that leveled attacks upon your organization, have they ever criticized you, or to your knowledge have they ever criticized the industry generally, because the industry has made in the past pictures which attacked the Nazi and Fascist totalitarian governments?

Mr. WOOD. Of course, they made no attacks during the time Hitler and Stalin were together; they welcomed that. Previous to that Hitler and Mussolini were both their enemies. As soon as Hitler and Stalin got together, then the whole thing was changed. It wasn't in the interest of America or in the interest of anything in particular but Stalin. That was their main idea.

Mr. NIXON. So far as this group is concerned, it is "thought control" whenever the motion-picture industry might make an anti-Communist film; but it isn't "thought control" if they were to make an anti-Fascist or anti-Nazi film? In other words, they welcome the first but oppose the latter?

Mr. WOOD. If you would read the review of that meeting of the "thought conference" held at Beverly Hills Hotel you would know exactly what was in their mind. It is only one thing. It is not America. As far as investigation is concerned, we would welcome an investigation. Our books are open to you at any time.

Mr. NIXON. You have indicated that the main success of those who follow the Communist line in Hollywood has not been in what they have been able to get into pictures but what they have been able to get out?

Mr. WOOD. I think they are both dangerous, but I think what they keep out is doubly dangerous. You wouldn't notice that. If the script is accepted, you don't check back. I do. I generally go back over the book and try to check to see if anything important was left out. But if they don't check back, they leave things out that puts this country and our way of living in a favorable light.

Mr. NIXON. In addition, they might also be interested in keeping out of the films anything that was derogatory of the Communist system of Government?

Mr. WOOD. Oh, my heavens, yes; oh, yes.

Mr. NIXON. But they would have no interest in keeping out of the film anything that was derogatory of a Fascist or the Nazi system of government; that is true?

Mr. WOOD. Pardon me. I didn't get that.

Mr. NIXON. They wouldn't be interested in keeping out of the film anything derogatory of nazism or fascism?

Mr. WOOD. No.

Mr. NIXON. Which illustrates the point I was trying to make in a rather lengthy way—that their interest is only when it comes to keeping anti-Communist things out of a picture.

Mr. WOOD. You see, if I may offer something there, these new names of fronts are used. They start a front, and they milk it. Where the money goes, you don't know. They come out and say they have a Greek relief. Everybody wants to give to the Greek relief. Checking into it, it is found it has gone to the guerrillas. Half of the people that give money—people feel they want to contribute to a good cause—they don't know the purpose for which the money is given; they don't know where the money goes. These organizations take one and milk it and start a new one. Sometimes they overlap and one is carried on over the other.

Mr. NIXON. If Hollywood were to make a picture pointing out the methods used—a factual picture pointing out the methods used and which have been used in Europe and are used at the present time by the Communists in taking over various governments now behind the iron curtain, a picture similar to those made about the Nazis before World War II, would you anticipate serious opposition from this group?

Mr. WOOD. They would try every possible way to stop it, of course.

Mr. NIXON. Is that one of the reasons such pictures have not been made in the past?

Mr. WOOD. No; I don't think so. I think at the present time the studio heads rather feel that anything having to do with war at the present time is not a good subject. I don't think anyone would hesitate to make it if there were a good story presented.

Mr. NIXON. To get clearly your attitude—because I think it is important that we draw the lines pretty clearly—from what you have indicated you believe that no control—or shall we say criticism—should be directed toward Hollywood for making pictures like the ones Mr. Stripling described, which may point out the sordid side of life in the United States?

Mr. WOOD. I think it would be a great mistake to have that censorship. It might rectify something that is wrong with our system.

Mr. NIXON. As a matter of fact, isn't it true that there are many pictures which point out the weak features of our own American system which have been made by people whose loyalty, insofar as communism is concerned, is absolutely unquestioned? In other words, people who are anti-Communist have made, and will continue to make, pictures which point up weaknesses in our American system?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir; if it is a good subject, they make it.

Mr. NIXON. You believe it is essential to maintain that privilege?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir; I do. It is very important. I think we should have freedom to make the things that are important. There may be something that you want to show, and it is important that it be shown to the public.

Mr. NIXON. Then your objection is simply that you believe it is essential that the knife cut both ways—that pictures can be made pointing out the true state of conditions in the United States—pictures can be made pointing out the good features of our system of government and our economic system, as well as the bad; but what you object to is the line which is followed by some of the people in Hollywood who are interested only in pointing up that side which will promote eventually the changing of our system of government and setting up in its place a Communist system of government?

Mr. WOOD. Very definitely; yes; I agree.

Mr. NIXON. What is involved is that those who follow the Communist line in Hollywood believe in a free screen and a free press and free speech only for the purpose of pointing up and advocating their own political ideas and the system of government which they would like to set up in the United States?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir; the only reason they support that idea is to tear us down. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no questions to ask Mr. Wood, but I would like to commend this gentleman for the work that he is doing out there, for the vigorous energy that he has piled into this work, and remind you with a great deal of pride that Mr. Wood is a Pennsylvanian and has exhibited here some very rugged Pennsylvanian characteristics.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Wood, I have been much interested in your statement to the effect that you have neither writers nor actors on your pay roll having Communist tendencies.

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAIL. I take it you heard the testimony of Mr. Warner this morning?

Mr. WOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAIL. If so, you heard Mr. Warner say he has certain scruples against releasing individuals from his pay roll for such tendencies because of the danger of depriving them of their livelihood.

Mr. WOOD. Well, you would hesitate to deprive them of their living, but they wouldn't hesitate to take your living or anything else away from you, because they do it, and they do it with a well-organized system; not only in the case of a writer but in every case they deprive people of work whenever they can, and they make an example of keeping their own people working to frighten people into joining them.

Mr. Warner did clean them out; I don't care what he said, he cleaned them out.

Mr. VAIL. I take it, then, you do not subscribe to the principle that he presented?

Mr. WOOD. I think he has a right to express it the way he wants to; but, after all, he cleaned them out, and that is the main thing with me.

Mr. VAIL. I think he was very sincere.

Mr. WOOD. I do, too.

Mr. VAIL. I know he is sincere. I think you are, too; but, of course, we have the problem of eliminating the Communist element from not only the Hollywood scene but also other scenes in America, and we have to have the full support and cooperation of the executives from each of those divisions.

Mr. Wood. I am sure you can get it from them.

Mr. VAIL. Do you belong to the directors group?

Mr. Wood. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. Do you also belong to the producers group?

Mr. Wood. No.

Mr. VAIL. Is that a voluntary act of your own?

Mr. Wood. I think so; yes. I direct my own pictures as a director with a certain code, and so on, and I think it is better for me to stay out as a director.

Mr. VAIL. If you have succeeded so admirably in cleaning out the Communist element and their fellow travelers from your studio, won't you agree, then, it is possible for all of the other producers to do likewise?

Mr. Wood. Well, you must consider that I am just one outfit. I have one writer; I may have two writers working, and that is the limit. They have probably 40 or 50 of them working, and when they get around to it I think you will get action from those gentlemen, too. I think the party should be outlawed, and I think these people should be labeled as agents of a foreign country, and let's get rid of them.

Mr. VAIL. I thoroughly agree with you along that line. I think communism is treason and should be treated as such; but, nevertheless, you probably know from the hearings of this committee in the past we have had some very prominent people in this country—people for whose opinion we have the highest respect—who are adamantly opposed to outlawing the organization because of the fact that it would send their activities underground.

You do not have that feeling?

Mr. Wood. No, sir; I haven't. I think you have to awaken the public to the fact that they are here and what they are doing. If you mention you are opposed to the Communist Party, then you are antilabor, anti-Semitic, or anti-Negro, and you will end up being called a Fascist, but they never start that until they find out you are opposed to the Communist Party; but if you wanted to drop their rompers you would find the hammer and sickle on their rear ends, I think.

Mr. VAIL. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood?

Mr. Wood (Congressman). Not because I have any partiality toward our name, Mr. Wood——

Mr. Wood. We ought to stick together.

Mr. Wood (Congressman). But I do desire to ask you one or two questions.

You stated in your testimony that in your opinion these people who are seeking to infiltrate into the picture industry, and other activities in America, and who preach doctrines subversive to our own Government, are, in your opinion, agents of a foreign power. Outside of the fact that they are actually doing the things they are doing, have you any other evidence that they are agents of a foreign government?

Mr. Wood. Well, I think if you are taking your orders from a foreign country you must be an agent of that foreign country, and there is no question about the Communist Party. It is not a local thing. If it was a political party and had the same ideals and ideas, and put them on a platform, I wouldn't open my mouth; but I don't think they have their own ideas; I think they get their orders and follow them out. If they thought that their way of handling the situation was better than ours, I wouldn't say anything, but I don't think they have any right to be permitted to go on and try and tear this country down and give us what Russia has.

Mr. Wood (Congressman). Do you mean by that you feel that each of them, the rank and file, are getting orders directly from the foreign government?

Mr. Wood. No; I don't think they get orders, personally; they take orders from the heads. They just give them their orders and tell them what to do, and they do it.

Mr. Wood (Congressman). Do you think they are all conscious of the fact that they are doing that under orders from a foreign power?

Mr. Wood. We have tried to figure out why they do it—why they take the abuse and give the money away they do. We can't figure it out, except that maybe they think if anything happens they are going to be the commissars here—they are going to be the executives of the studios.

Some of them, I think, want to be intellectuals. I think they have different reasons; but we cannot quite figure out how they can dominate these people, Americans, and make them do the things they do. There are some of them back there now.

The CHAIRMAN. We will take care of them when their turn comes.

Mr. Wood. I will help you, sir.

Mr. Wood (Congressman). If they were all eliminated from the picture, would it, in your opinion, weaken the effectiveness of the picture industry or the purpose for which it is organized?

Mr. Wood. Definitely not. There are only a few of them. There are some stars that are important, yes; but the rest of them wouldn't make a bit of difference, we wouldn't know they were gone. We have lost some very fine people in this business. The greatest man we ever had in the business was Irving Thalberg. He died. It was a great loss. These other people, we wouldn't know they were out of here. If they went back to Russia—and I hope they do—we would be better off, that is all.

Mr. Wood (Congressman). Mr. Chairman, for myself I desire to extend my personal thanks to Mr. Wood for his courageous and efficient manner in appearing before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Wood, do the Communists maintain any schools or laboratories in Hollywood for the purpose of training actors or writers?

Mr. Wood. Yes; they have a laboratory theater there.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is the function of this theater?

Mr. Wood. Well, in the old days we used to have youngsters who had a chance to study to become actors and actresses through the stock companies. Every city had two or three stock companies, but now

most of them have been eliminated. They have to go to these schools. They put on plays. They get parts, they study and become efficient, and we see them in the theaters, or see them in some Pasadena playhouse, or something like that, but the laboratory theater, I think, is very definitely under the control of the Communist Party and the people that teach there. Any kid that goes in there with American ideals hasn't a chance in the world.

There is another thing that worries me and that is the art centers. I think most of these places are partly supported by the GI, and I think those boys are getting some poison that is not good for them.

Then we have the educational center out there——

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that the Peoples Educational Center?

Mr. WOOD. Yes. Eddie Dmytryk—I referred to him—is the instructor there, so you get an idea of what they are getting to.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is he a director?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether the Peoples Educational Center is a successor to the School for Writers of the League of American Writers?

Mr. WOOD. I didn't get that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not the Peoples Educational Center is a successor to the School for Writers of the League of American Writers?

Mr. WOOD. I am not quite sure of that. I think some of the other men from our organization who will follow may have the facts on those things.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right.

Mr. WOOD. I am sorry I cannot give it to you.

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other member have any other questions?

Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. Have you read Trotsky's book, "Stalin"?

Mr. WOOD. No.

Mr. McDOWELL. You said here a moment ago you had termed anti-Semitic and Fascist. Trotsky named Stalin time after time after time, in his book, as being anti-Semitic, so on that point alone you and Stalin stand together?

Mr. WOOD. That doesn't stop there. There are personal matters and everything else. We are constantly being threatened, and so on.

Mr. McDOWELL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood, to use the slang expression, you really lay it on the line. If the great, great majority of persons in industry, labor, and education showed the same amount of courage that you show we would not have to worry about communism or fascism in this country. In other words, you've got guts.

Mr. WOOD. Thank you very much. You will find the men in our organization have the same, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I want the record to show Mr. Wood is here in response to a subpoena which was served upon him.¹³

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

(Witness excused.)

¹³ See appendix, p. 524, for exhibit 19.

Mr. STRIPLING. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Mr. Louis B. Mayer.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mayer, will you raise your right hand, please.

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MAYER. I do.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS B. MAYER

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Mayer, will you state your full name, please?

Mr. MAYER. Louis Burt Mayer.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Mayer?

Mr. MAYER. I was born in Russia and came to this country when I was an infant; I came to Canada and from Canada here.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the interrogation of Mr. Mayer will be done by Mr. Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like for the record to show Mr. Mayer is accompanied by counsel, Mr. McNutt. Mr. McNutt was with Mr. Warner this morning. Do you care for any further identification of Mr. McNutt?

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing further.

Mr. WOOD. Is Mr. Mayer here under subpoena?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Mayer is here under subpoena, Mr. Wood.¹⁴

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mayer, will you tell us what your present occupation is, please?

Mr. MAYER. I am head of the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer studios, Culver City, Calif.

Mr. SMITH. How long have you been associated with the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MAYER. Well, in producing, for about 25 years; in all branches, about 40 years. In 1907 is when I started.

Mr. SMITH. Will you tell us some of the positions you have held prior to your present position?

Mr. MAYER. I ran a motion-picture theater, dramatic houses, vaudeville houses, distributed pictures in Boston and came west to produce.

Mr. SMITH. How many people are employed at M-G-M, approximately, at the present time?

Mr. MAYER. Between four and five thousand.

Mr. SMITH. Approximately how many pictures do they make each year?

Mr. MAYER. It varies from 25 to 50.

Mr. SMITH. Could you give the committee an idea of the gross income of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer over 1 year, or over a number of years?

Mr. MAYER. That I don't know, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer is the largest, or at least one of the large studios in the motion-picture business; is that right?

Mr. MAYER. It is considered so, sir, I believe.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mayer, as the chairman stated this morning—and I believe you were present at the time—the purpose of this inquiry is to

¹⁴ See appendix, p. 524, for exhibit 20.

determine the extent of Communist infiltration into the motion-picture industry.

Since you have been in Hollywood have you had an opportunity and have you observed whether or not there is any Communist infiltration into the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MAYER. Could I read a statement, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. May I see the statement, please?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that will be all right.¹⁵

Mr. MAYER. Communism to me is so completely opposed to the principles of democratic government that I welcome the opportunity provided by this committee to be of any service possible to bring out the true facts concerning reported infiltration of un-American ideology into motion pictures.

Like others in the motion-picture industry, I have maintained a relentless vigilance against un-American influences. If, as has been alleged, Communists have attempted to use the screen for subversive purposes, I am proud of our success in circumventing them.

I have abundant reason to cherish the blessings of our democracy, and to resist with all my strength any effort to undermine it. I join with this committee in every determination to safeguard the precious freedom entrusted to us.

During my 25 years in the motion-picture industry I have always sought to maintain the screen as a force for public good.

The motion-picture industry employs many thousands of people. As is the case with the newspaper, radio, publishing, and theater businesses, we cannot be responsible for the political views of each individual employee. It is, however, our complete responsibility to determine what appears on the motion-picture screen.

It is my earnest hope that this committee will perform a public service by recommending to the Congress legislation establishing a national policy regulating employment of Communists in private industry. It is my belief they should be denied the sanctuary of the freedom they seek to destroy.

Communism is based upon a doctrine inconsistent with American liberty. It advocates destruction of the system of free enterprise under which our industry has achieved popularity among the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Our hatred of communism is returned in full measure. The Communists attack our screen as an instrument of capitalism. Few, if any, of our films ever reach Russia. It hates us because it fears us. We show too much of the American way of life, of human dignity, of the opportunity and the happiness to be enjoyed in a democracy.

More than any other country in the world, we have enjoyed the fullest freedom of speech in all means of communication. It is this freedom that has enabled the motion picture to carry the message to the world of our democratic way of life.

The primary function of motion pictures is to bring entertainment to the screen. But, like all other industries, we were lending every support to our Government in the war effort, and whenever a subject could be presented entertaining, we tried, insofar as possible, to cooperate in building morale.

¹⁵ See appendix, p. 525, for exhibit 21.

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer produced Joe Smith American as a defense-worker incentive. There were a number of films produced for the Army and Navy. Then, there was Mrs. Miniver, which was rushed into release at the urgent request of the United States officials to meet the rising tide of anti-English feeling that followed the fall of Tobruk.

There were a number of representatives of the Government who made periodical visits to the studios during the war. They discussed with us from time to time the types of pictures which they felt might assist the war effort. They were coordinators and at no time did they attempt to tell us what we should or should not do. We made our own decisions on production. We are proud of our war efforts and the results speak for themselves.

Mention has been made of the picture *Song of Russia*, as being friendly to Russia at the time it was made. Of course it was. It was made to be friendly. In 1938 we made *Ninotchka*, and shortly thereafter *Comrade X*, with Clark Gable and Hedy Lamarr—both of these films kidded Russia.

It was in April of 1942 that the story for *Song of Russia* came to our attention. It seemed a good medium of entertainment and at the same time offered an opportunity for a pat on the back for our then ally, Russia. It also offered an opportunity to use the music of Tschaikowsky. We mentioned this to the Government coordinators and they agreed with us that it would be a good idea to make the picture.

According to research I have made, our newspapers were headlining the desperate situation of the Russians at Stalingrad at that time. Admiral Standley, American Ambassador to the Soviet Union, made a vigorous plea for all-out aid. He pleaded for assistance second only to the supplies being provided the United States Fleet, and emphasized that the best way to win the war was to keep the Russians killing the Germans, and that the most effective way was to give them all the help they needed.

The United States Army Signal Corps made *The Battle of Stalingrad*, released in 1943, with a prolog expressing high tribute from President Roosevelt, our Secretaries of State, War, and Navy, and from Generals Marshall and MacArthur.

The final script of *Song of Russia* was little more than a pleasant musical romance—the story of a boy and girl that, except for the music of Tschaikowsky, might just as well have taken place in Switzerland or England or any other country on the earth.

I thought Robert Taylor ideal for the leading male role in *Song of Russia*, but he did not like the story. This was not unusual as actors and actresses many times do not care for stories suggested to them.

At the time, Taylor mentioned his pending commission in the Navy, so I telephoned the Secretary of the Navy, Frank Knox, and told him of the situation, recalling the good that had been accomplished with Mrs. Miniver and other pictures released during the war period. The Secretary called back and said he thought Taylor could be given time to make the film before being called to the service. Accordingly, Taylor made the picture.

Since 1942 when the picture was planned, our relationship with Russia has changed. But viewed in the light of the war emergency

at the time, it is my opinion that it could not be construed as anything other than for the entertainment purpose intended and a pat on the back for our then ally, Russia.

I am proud of the motion-picture industry; proud of its record in war and peace. With press and radio, it shares today a solemn trust—to preserve our sacred freedom of speech and fight with our every energy any attempt to use that freedom as a cloak for subversive assassins of liberty.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mayer, since you have been in Hollywood, have you observed whether or not there are any efforts on behalf of Communists to infiltrate themselves into the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MAYER. I have been told many times about Communists. I have never feared them. They can't get a single thing into our pictures or our studio under our set-up.

Mr. SMITH. Why is that?

Mr. MAYER. Because the only ones that I would have to worry about are the producers, the editors, the executives, because our scripts are read and re-read by so many of the executive force, producers and editors, that if you looked carefully at 1,200 or 1,500 pictures I produced with my people out at the studio you would be surprised how little you could possibly point to, even now, when we are on the lookout for it, particularly at this time.

Mr. SMITH. It is necessary to employ certain personnel to keep the Communists from trying to get information into the pictures?

Mr. MAYER. No; we don't engage anybody. These men are supposed to figure out what will make a good picture. If they should find anything detrimental to the American Government or the Congress I would never allow anything against anybody in our Government or in our Congress. I would never allow them to have a laugh at such a serious price.

Mr. SMITH. Are there any Communists, to your knowledge, in Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer?

Mr. MAYER. They have mentioned two or three writers to me several times. There is no proof about it, except they mark them as Communists, and when I look at the pictures they have written for us I can't find once where they have written something like that. Whether they think they can't get away with it in our place, or what, I can't tell you, but there are the pictures and they will speak for themselves. I have as much contempt for them as much as anybody living in this world.

Mr. SMITH. Who are these people they have named?

Mr. MAYER. Trumbo and Lester Cole, they said. I think there was one other fellow, a third one.

Mr. SMITH. Is that Dalton Trumbo you are speaking of?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. And his position, please?

Mr. MAYER. He is a writer.

Mr. SMITH. And Lester Cole?

Mr. MAYER. A writer.

Mr. SMITH. Have you observed any efforts on their part to get Communist propaganda into their pictures?

Mr. MAYER. I have never heard of any.

Mr. SMITH. Do you personally read the scripts?

Mr. MAYER. Some of them; a great many.

Mr. SMITH. Do you personally know if any efforts were made to get Communist propaganda into the pictures?

Mr. MAYER. I caught something in a script recently that was anything but Communist connected. They are just as violent against them as I or you and yet there were two scenes and they couldn't believe I was right and I had to read it to them. They were not Communists who wrote it, but they set the scenes perfectly and we changed it and took it out. We found some other medium to correct the situation.

Mr. SMITH. The third individual you mentioned, would that be Donald Ogden Stewart?

Mr. MAYER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Do you know what salaries these men are paid?

Mr. MAYER. I don't know offhand. Two of them are very high, Stewart and Trumbo.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have here, in answer to a subpoena, the official records of the salaries paid Mr. Dalton Trumbo, Mr. Lester Cole, and Donald Ogden Stewart over a period of the last 5 years, which information I would like to submit at this time for the record.¹⁶

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Dalton Trumbo, during the year 1943, received \$76,250; during 1944, \$39,000; in 1945, \$95,000; in 1946, \$71,000; in 1947, to and including October 4, 1947, \$85,000.

Mr. MAYER. I don't think that is all, Mr. Smith. They work in other studios also during the same year.

Mr. SMITH. This is from Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Mr. MAYER. Yes; but they probably earn much more than that during that same period.

Mr. SMITH. On Lester Cole, who has not been employed at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer for a period of 5 years, his record is 1945 to and including October 4, 1947. The record reflects that from Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer pictures in 1945 his salary was \$33,491.67; in 1946, \$53,666.67; in 1947, to and including October 4, \$43,700.

Donald Ogden Stewart, in 1943, from Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, \$40,000; in 1944, \$27,083.33; in 1946, \$65,000; in 1947, to and including October 4, \$17,500.

Mr. Mayer, these individuals that have been mentioned as being reported to you as Communists, do you think the studios should continue to employ those individuals?

Mr. MAYER. I have asked counsel. They claim that unless you can prove they are Communists they could hold you for damages. Saturday when I arrived here I saw in the papers a case where the high court of New York State just held you could not even say a man was a Communist sympathizer without being liable if you cannot prove it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, may I ask a question right there?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. If you were shown the Communist dues cards of any one of these three individuals, then would you continue to employ them?

Mr. MAYER. No, sir.

¹⁶ See appendix, p. 525, for exhibits 22-24.

Mr. SMITH. By the same token, Mr. Mayer, would you employ a Bundist, a known member of the Bund?

Mr. MAYER. I have probably had them; I wouldn't employ him knowingly; no, sir.

Mr. SMITH. At the present time?

Mr. MAYER. No, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Is it correct from your testimony that a great effort or considerable effort is made by the studios to keep Communist writers or persons alleged to be Communist writers from injecting propaganda into the pictures?

Mr. MAYER. We haven't had that problem in our studio. I heard Mr. Warner testify this morning. He says he has had it, but I can't say I have had it.

Mr. SMITH. I understood you to say it is impossible for them to get material into the pictures because you have a number of readers and other individuals that are always checking on them; that you, yourself, recently observed some material that might have been, although under the circumstances surrounding the writer it obviously was not.

What I would like to determine from you is what do you think will happen in a period of 5, 6, or 7 years if these individuals keep on infiltrating, one, two, three, and four, and so on? At that time maybe we won't have individuals that can keep this information out of your pictures.

Mr. MAYER. I am just hopeful, like I told you in California, Mr. Smith, that perhaps out of this hearing will come a recommendation to the Congress for legislation on which there can be no question and they will give us a policy as to how to handle American citizens who do not deserve to be American citizens, and if they are Communists how to get them out of our place.

Mr. SMITH. Going back to the picture *Song of Russia*, I notice in your statement, Mr. Mayer, you state:

The final script of *Song of Russia* was little more than a pleasant musical romance—the story of a boy and girl that, except for the music of Tchaikowsky, might just as well have taken place in Switzerland or England or any other country on the earth.

Is that your definite opinion on that particular picture?

Mr. MAYER. Basically, yes.

Mr. SMITH. Don't you feel the picture had scene after scene that grossly misrepresented Russia as it is today, or as it was at that time?

Mr. MAYER. I never was in Russia, but you tell me how you would make a picture laid in Russia that would do any different than what we did there?

Mr. SMITH. Don't you feel from what you have read, and from what you have heard from other people, that the scenes just did not depict Russia in one iota?

Mr. MAYER. We did not attempt to depict Russia; we attempted to show a Russian girl entreating this American conductor to conduct a concert in her village where they have a musical festival every year and as it inevitably happens this girl fell in love with the conductor, and he with her. Then we showed the attack of the Germans on the Russians and the war disrupted this union.

Mr. SMITH. The original story was written by whom, Mr. Mayer?

Mr. MAYER. I don't recall now.

Mr. SMITH. I believe it was written by Mr. Lester Mittler and Victor Trivas as *The Scorched Earth*.

Mr. MAYER. I think so.

Mr. SMITH. Then it was assigned to two writers to write the first script. Do you recall those two individuals?

Mr. MAYER. No; but Joe Pasternak is the producer who got interested in that.

Mr. SMITH. I believe the script shows it was written by Paul Jarrico and Richard Collins. Would that be correct?

Mr. MAYER. If it says so; yes.

Mr. SMITH. Did you read the first script, Mr. Mayer?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. What was your opinion at that time?

Mr. MAYER. They had farm collectivism in it and I threw it out and said, "This will not be made until they give me the story they told me originally when I approved the making of it."

Mr. SMITH. In other words, the first script, in your opinion, was not producible?

Mr. MAYER. Not the first.

Mr. SMITH. Why not?

Mr. MAYER. Because I will not preach any ideology except American, and I don't even treat that. I let that take its own course and speak for itself.

Mr. SMITH. That showed an ideology or condition, so far as Russia is concerned, that you did not approve of?

Mr. MAYER. I wouldn't have it.

Mr. SMITH. As to the last script then, was the script, in your opinion, satisfactorily cleaned up?

Mr. MAYER. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Who was responsible, if you know, for taking the collectivism and other things out of the script?

Mr. MAYER. I ordered it out, and the producer said it would all be rewritten, and it was. That is why Taylor was delayed getting into the service.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question right there?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mayer, you say the main reason why Taylor was delayed getting into the service was because the first script had these foreign ideologies in it and was not acceptable to you, so there was this delay?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Did a Government representative ever come to you, Mr. Mayer, about that picture, as to the making of it?

Mr. MAYER. I don't recall anybody coming about the making of it. I think I told them about it or discussed it with them. So much happened in that period, coming and going. They had an office out there—War Information, I think they called themselves.

Mr. SMITH. Have you seen the picture recently, Mr. Mayer?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. What are your feelings about the picture, as to the damage it might cause to the people in the United States, that is, misleading them as to conditions in Russia?

Mr. MAYER. What scenes are you referring to?

Mr. SMITH. Do you recall scenes in there at the night club where everybody was drinking?

Mr. MAYER. They do in Moscow.

Mr. SMITH. Do you feel that that represents Russia as it is today?

Mr. MAYER. I didn't make it as it is today, I made it when they were our ally in 1943.

Mr. SMITH. Do you feel it represents Russia in 1943 as conditions were in Russia?

Mr. MAYER. That is what I understood, that they go to night clubs there in Moscow. If only the rest of the Russians had a chance to do the same thing, it would be fine, but they don't. This picture was laid in Moscow.

Mr. SMITH. Has Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer ever produced an anti-Communist picture?

Mr. MAYER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Would you tell us the name of it?

Mr. MAYER. Ninotchka. They kidded the life out of communism. It was Ninotchka, with Greta Garbo. We had a big deal pending with the Soviets for 60 pictures, I think, and Mr. Scates decided he better show it to these commissars, so he showed it to them, and that was the end of the deal.

Then another one was Comrade X, in which Hedy Lamar was a conductor and Clark Gable was Comrade X. We kidded the pants off of them in that picture, but they were not our allies then.

Mr. SMITH. Are you making any anti-Communist pictures at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer at the present time?

Mr. MAYER. I think the one we are going to start shooting promptly [laughter]—we have been preparing it for some 6 months.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mayer, these hearings haven't anything to do with the promptness, have they?

Mr. MAYER. No, no; it is just out now, called Vespers in Vienna. The script is about ready. The original title was The Red Danube. The Book of the Month Club wanted the other title, and so we agreed with the author that the publisher use the other title "Vespers in Vienna." It takes several months to lick a big book like that, but it is almost ready to start production.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Mayer, are you familiar with the picture Tennessee Johnson?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir; we made it.

Mr. SMITH. Do you recall at the time you made it, or just before, did you receive any protests from any individuals in the studio against making the picture?

Mr. MAYER. There was quite a lot of confusion about that picture, and I think I yelled as loud as anybody about some scenes which I didn't think were good.

Mr. SMITH. Why was that?

Mr. MAYER. Well, because I didn't believe it.

Mr. SMITH. Did you receive a protest from any individuals, do you recall?

Mr. MAYER. I don't recall, Mr. Smith. If you will remind me, I will be glad to tell you.

Mr. SMITH. That is all the questions at this time.

Mr. McDOWELL. What was the name of this picture you are talking about?

Mr. MAYER. Tennessee Johnson.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all the questions you have at this time?

Mr. SMITH. It is; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. Since you have been in the production business, Mr. Mayer, approximately how many pictures have you made?

Mr. MAYER. About 1,200, probably.

Mr. Wood. What criticism, if any, has there been from the public or the press or the Government leveled against any of them that you have made?

Mr. MAYER. Well, Mr. Congressman, we have always received great approbation, until this thing started, about this picture Song of Russia.

Mr. Wood. Well, about the time that you made Song of Russia—by the way, at that time we were engaged in a war in which Russia was one of our allies, is that correct?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. Perhaps that is one of the reasons that the committee wanted to hear from you, with reference to the underlying reasons that prompted the production of that particular picture. Can you give us any more enlightenment on that?

Mr. MAYER. Yes. As I told you, we made Joe Smith, the American, which was an incentive to war workers. Then we made one that the Government was terribly anxious to have made, those who used to come and visit us, to show the industrial strength of America. We called that picture American Romance, in technicolor. It showed an immigrant, coming from Sweden, getting by the Statue of Liberty. And through Ellis Island, he walks out to Minnesota, to the iron mines, where he had some relations—walking across the country, getting a ride here and there. He became a Henry Ford under our system, which makes that possible. He became a great industrialist.

Mr. Wood. That was the American—

Mr. MAYER. American Romance, in technicolor.

Mr. Wood. Mr. Mayer, I believe back in May of this year you made a talk before the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, in San Francisco; is that right?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. Wood. About the 7th of May, was it?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir; I think it was.

Mr. Wood. I find in the Congressional—

Mr. MAYER. July 7.

Mr. Wood. I find in the Congressional Record, under date of July 15 of this year, an insertion in the Congressional Record by Hon. Gordon L. McDonald, of the State of California, of what purports to be a copy of that address.¹⁷ Have you read it?

Mr. MAYER. No, sir.

Mr. Wood. You have not?

Mr. MAYER. No, sir.

¹⁷ See appendix, p. 525, for exhibit 25.

Mr. WOOD. I would like to quote from some portions of that speech as it appears in the Congressional Record and—by the way, in order to have it inserted, the page number is 3727—see if you still subscribe to some of the statements you made in that address:

More precious than our lives we hold our liberty, a liberty that means free speech, free press, the right to assemble and remonstrate against real or imaginary wrongs and the right to worship in any shrine, a liberty that means free enterprise and unlimited opportunity, a liberty that lights the footsteps of the poor boy born in a floorless cabin in Kentucky as brightly and as happily as the boy born to wealth and social position.

Mr. MAYER. Mr. Congressman, that is what makes us great. That would make any country great that only knew how to appreciate it.

Mr. WOOD. You still subscribe to that?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You say, then, that that is a correct quotation of your speech in San Francisco on the 7th of May?

Mr. MAYER. Seventh of July, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Seventh of July.

I quote again:

There is a heavy responsibility upon the producers of motion pictures. A motion picture cannot only afford entertainment but be of educational value. In this crisis, it can portray fairly and honestly the American ways of life and can be a powerful influence in the life of millions in other countries who are either denied access to our way of life or who never had the opportunity of experiencing it.

Do you still feel that responsibility, as a producer of motion pictures?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You are quoted as saying further in that address that:

In common with newspapers and radio, the screen fights the battle for freedom of speech. Jefferson said that "That that government is best which governs least." Intelligent, self-disciplined industry is our greatest assurance that the freedom guaranteed us by our Constitution will not be denied.

Do you still subscribe to that doctrine?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. And, in conclusion, you are quoted as having said that:

The responsibility is great. We all appreciate that responsibility. It is my deep and solemn conviction that the Maker of the Universe intended that men should be free and not slaves, that the people of the earth should enjoy the bountiful resources which nature has placed under every sky, that men and women should be happy and not oppressed, and that there should be a song of peace and good will in every heart.

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You still subscribe to that?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You were quoted somewhat in the press from that address. And I quote from one of the daily papers in New York, in which you are quoted as having said that:

The only interpretation and understanding of communism that is worthy of belief by the American people is that it threatens the way of life upon this entire planet. It threatens our fundamental concepts of human rights and liberties.

Is that a correct quotation of the sentiment that you then expressed?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. And you still subscribe to it?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. You were quoted in this same article in the New York newspaper as having said that:

Soviet Russia must be recognized for and plainly called exactly what it is in terms of international relationship—a powerful nation that challenges and discredits our liberty and that seeks to spread its influence to dominate the lives of men and women in smaller nations.

Is that a correct quotation of the sentiments that you expressed at that time?

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOOD. Now I will ask you again, Mr. Mayer, if at the time you took into your employment the men that you have named here who you say have now been designated as men who had attained communistic beliefs you knew that those men believed in and subscribed to a doctrine that you have thus announced, in the excerpts which I read to you, would you keep them in your employment?

Mr. MAYER. No, sir. I could prove it then, if they challenged me.

Mr. WOOD. I believe that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Don't you have any more?

Mr. WOOD. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No; and thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. I have one question—

Mr. WOOD. By the way, Mr. Mayer, one more question, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood has one more question.

Mr. WOOD. When did you receive the subpoena to appear before this committee?

Mr. MAYER. I don't remember exactly what date.

Mr. STRIPLING. I have it right here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAYER. Thank you.

Mr. STRIPLING. It was served upon Mr. Mayer on September 29.

Mr. WOOD. All right.

Mr. MAYER. September 29.

Mr. VAIL. I have but one question to ask of Mr. Mayer. I appreciate that his answer can only represent his opinion, but I believe that it will go far to relieve the American public concerning a very puzzling question. Can you tell us, Mr. Mayer, just what motivates these writers and these actors whose incomes are in astronomical figures to embrace communism and to seek to destroy this free American Government that has afforded them their opportunity and has given them the place they occupy in the affections of the public and positions of power and affluence?

Mr. MAYER. My own opinion is, Mr. Congressman, which I have expressed many times in discussion, I think they are cracked. It can't be otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. Any more questions, Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Mayer.

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like to direct some questions to you about Song of Russia.

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. I realize this was a war picture, made during the war, and I want to get this clear: Was this picture made at the request of the Government?

Mr. MAYER. I had thought originally it was. I tried to think it out as to who, and it is just blank to me. I have come to the conclusion, by talking to Mr. Cates, who was the executive in charge of the producer who made it, and talking to the producer—he claimed that, when he started with me, he would like to make a picture with Tchaikowsky's music and it would have to be laid in Russia. That is how it all got started. This story *Scorched Earth* was dug up as the premise on which we would be able to use that music. I recall talking to some of the men that were in the liaison office between the Government and ourselves about the picture when we were going to make it. I know they liked the idea that we were going to make it because they did want a pat on Russia's back, to keep them fighting.

If you don't mind my saying so, I have got to confess that was the only time in my life that I gave money to Russia, and if I were to be told that 2 years ago, God help the one that asked for it. But when they made the plea that we must go out and help Russia, I felt that I would rather they kill Russians than kill Americans and I gave them money. I made the picture with the same spirit. I thought Bob Taylor, being a musician, would be convincing as a conductor.

Mr. STRIPLING. What do you mean by making the picture it would keep Russia fighting?

Mr. MAYER. It would show our feeling that we appreciate them. It would show that we liked the Russian people and applaud their efforts in a war. It was pretty dark around Stalingrad there at that period. It was for the same reason that the British thought it was great to make *Miniver*, to show the American people the courage of the English people in taking the beating that they took.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you say, however, that the picture was made independent of any Government suggestion?

Mr. MAYER. Well, I explained to you, to the best of my recollection—

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes; but—

Mr. MAYER. They were glad I was making it; I remember that. But I tried to figure out who it was, if anybody, who asked me to make a picture about Russia. They all tried to assure me that it was the other way around: That when I told them I was going to make one, wanted to make one, it was a good idea to pat them on the back.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Mayer, on May 14 the subcommittee was sitting in Los Angeles, Calif. The witness was Mr. Robert Taylor, who I believe is under contract with your studio.

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. He testified:

For instance, in 1943 we did a picture in the studio, from which I tried desperately to get out, called *Song of Russia*. They wanted me to do it. I didn't want to do it because I thought it was definitely Communist propaganda. In other words, it happened to paint Russia in a light in which I personally never had conceived Russia.

I won't go on with Mr. Taylor's testimony at this point, Mr. Chairman, because he is to appear and testify himself, but I want to point out that Mr. Taylor, who played the leading role in this picture, considered the picture to be Communist propaganda. I saw it myself. I personally think it was Communist propaganda.

I would like to present a qualified reviewer and get their opinion of it, but before doing so I would like to refer to a letter which Mr. Lowell Mellett wrote as Chief of the Motion Picture Division, Office of War Information. This letter appeared in the Washington Star of Sunday, October 19, addressed to Capt. Leland P. Lovette, Director of Public Relations, Navy Department.

MY DEAR CAPTAIN LOVETTE: Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer have asked for a delay in the induction of Robert Taylor as a naval aviation cadet to permit the completion of a picture now under production, with Taylor as the star. Much of the picture already has been shot, but there remains several weeks' further shooting. This picture has Russia for its scene and the Office of War Information believes that, based on the script which we have read, it will serve a useful purpose in the war effort. It has no political implications, being designed primarily to acquaint the American people with the people of one of our Allied Nations.

Yours sincerely,

LOWELL MELLETT.

Now, Mr. Mayer, you stated that you recently viewed the picture.

Mr. MAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is it your opinion that there were no political implications in it whatsoever?

Mr. MAYER. I am convinced of that. I am under oath, and if I met my God I would still repeat the same thing.

I have here reviews of the picture from the New York Times, the New York Post, the London Daily Sketch, the Washington Post, and the New York Herald Tribune. There is only two lines or so in each one. The New York Times said:

It is really a honey of a topical musical film, full of rare good humor, rich vitality, and a proper respect for the Russians' fight in the war.

The New York Post says:

* * * a pretty little romance with a made-in-America back-drop of Russia * * * cozy, clean, luxuriously musical film * * *.

The London Daily Sketch says:

* * * turned out to be strictly an American anthem.

The Washington Post said:

It is one film about Russia which will probably be little assailed as propaganda * * *.

The New York Herald Tribune said:

Russia itself has all too little to do with Song of Russia.

Here is that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Mayer, I would like for you to stand aside for a moment. I would like to call as the next witness Miss Ayn Rand.

The CHAIRMAN. And, Mr. Mayer, thank you very much. We will probably call you back, though, a little later, or tomorrow morning.

Mr. MAYER. Shall I stay over?

The CHAIRMAN. You better stay for a little while. We will let you know.

Mr. MAYER. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Raise your right hand, please, Miss Rand.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Miss RAND. I do.

TESTIMONY OF MISS AYN RAND

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

Mr. STRIPLING. Miss Rand, will you state your name, please, for the record?

Miss RAND. Ayn Rand, or Mrs. Frank O'Connor.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is A-y-n?

Miss RAND. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. R-a-n-d?

Miss RAND. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that your pen name?

Miss RAND. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. And what is your married name?

Miss RAND. Mrs. Frank O'Connor.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where were you born, Miss Rand?

Miss RAND. In St. Petersburg, Russia.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did you leave Russia?

Miss RAND. In 1926.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been employed in Hollywood?

Miss RAND. I have been in pictures on and off since late in 1926, but specifically as a writer this time I have been in Hollywood since late 1943 and am now under contract as a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you written various novels?

Miss RAND. One second. May I have one moment to get this in order?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Miss RAND. Yes, I have written two novels. My first one was called *We, the Living*, which was a story about Soviet Russia and was published in 1936. The second one was *The Fountainhead*, published in 1943.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was that a best seller—*The Fountainhead*?

Miss RAND. Yes; thanks to the American public.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know how many copies were sold?

Miss RAND. The last I heard was 360,000 copies. I think there have been some more since.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have been employed as a writer in Hollywood?

Miss RAND. Yes; I am under contract at present.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you name some of the stories or scripts you have written for Hollywood?

Miss RAND. I have done the script of *The Fountainhead*, which has not been produced yet, for Warner Bros., and two adaptations for Hal Wallis Production, at Paramount, which were not my stories but on which I did the screen plays, which were *Love Letters* and *You Came Along*.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Miss Rand, you have heard the testimony of Mr. Mayer?

Miss RAND. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have read the letter I read from Lowell Mellett?

Miss RAND. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Which says that the picture *Song of Russia* has no political implications?

Miss RAND. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you at the request of Mr. Smith, the investigator for this committee, view the picture *Song of Russia*?

Miss RAND. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Within the past 2 weeks?

Miss RAND. Yes; on October 13 to be exact.

Mr. STRIPLING. In Hollywood?

Miss RAND. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you give the committee a break-down of your summary of the picture relating to either propaganda or an untruthful account or distorted account of conditions in Russia?

Miss RAND. Yes.

First of all I would like to define what we mean by propaganda. We have all been talking about it, but nobody——

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you talk into the microphone?

Miss RAND. Can you hear me now?

Nobody has stated just what they mean by propaganda. Now, I use the term to mean that Communist propaganda is anything which gives a good impression of communism as a way of life. Anything that sells people the idea that life in Russia is good and that people are free and happy would be Communist propaganda. Am I not correct? I mean, would that be a fair statement to make—that that would be Communist propaganda?

Now, here is what the picture *Song of Russia* contains. It starts with an American conductor, played by Robert Taylor, giving a concert in America for Russian war relief. He starts playing the American national anthem and the national anthem dissolves into a Russian mob, with the sickle and hammer on a red flag very prominent above their heads. I am sorry, but that made me sick. That is something which I do not see how native Americans permit, and I am only a naturalized American. That was a terrible touch of propaganda. As a writer, I can tell you just exactly what it suggests to the people. It suggests literally and technically that it is quite all right for the American national anthem to dissolve into the Soviet. The term here is more than just technical. It really was symbolically intended, and it worked out that way. The anthem continues, played by a Soviet band. That is the beginning of the picture.

Now we go to the pleasant love story. Mr. Taylor is an American who came there apparently voluntarily to conduct concerts for the Soviet. He meets a little Russian girl from a village who comes to him and begs him to go to her village to direct concerts there. There are no GPU agents and nobody stops her. She just comes to Moscow and meets him. He falls for her and decides he will go, because he is falling in love. He asks her to show him Moscow. She says she has never seen it. He says, "I will show it to you."

They see it together. The picture then goes into a scene of Moscow, supposedly. I don't know where the studio got its shots, but I have never seen anything like it in Russia. First you see Moscow buildings—big, prosperous-looking, clean buildings, with something like

swans or sailboats in the foreground. Then you see a Moscow restaurant that just never existed there. In my time, when I was in Russia, there was only one such restaurant, which was nowhere as luxurious as that and no one could enter it except commissars and profiteers. Certainly a girl from a village, who in the first place would never have been allowed to come voluntarily, without permission, to Moscow, could not afford to enter it, even if she worked 10 years. However, there is a Russian restaurant with a menu such as never existed in Russia at all and which I doubt even existed before the revolution. From this restaurant they go on to this tour of Moscow. The streets are clean and prosperous-looking. There are no food lines anywhere. You see shots of the marble subway—the famous Russian subway out of which they make such propaganda capital. There is a marble statue of Stalin thrown in. There is a park where you see happy little children in white blouses running around. I don't know whose children they are, but they are really happy kiddies. They are not homeless children in rags, such as I have seen in Russia. Then you see an excursion boat, on which the Russian people are smiling, sitting around very cheerfully, dressed in some sort of satin blouses such as they only wear in Russian restaurants here.

Then they attend a luxurious dance. I don't know where they got the idea of the clothes and the settings that they used at the ball and—

MR. STRIPLING. Is that a ballroom scene?

MISS RAND. Yes; the ballroom—where they dance. It was an exaggeration even for this country. I have never seen anybody wearing such clothes and dancing to such exotic music when I was there. Of course, it didn't say whose ballroom it is or how they get there. But there they are—free and dancing very happily.

Incidentally, I must say at this point that I understand from correspondents who have left Russia and been there later than I was and from people who escaped from there later than I did that the time I saw it, which was in 1926, was the best time since the Russian revolution. At that time conditions were a little better than they have become since. In my time we were a bunch of ragged, starved, dirty, miserable people who had only two thoughts in our mind. That was our complete terror—afraid to look at one another, afraid to say anything for fear of who is listening and would report us—and where to get the next meal. You have no idea what it means to live in a country where nobody has any concern except food, where all the conversation is about food because everybody is so hungry that that is all they can think about and that is all they can afford to do. They have no idea of politics. They have no idea of any pleasant romances or love—nothing but food and fear.

That is what I saw up to 1926. That is not what the picture shows.

Now, after this tour of Moscow, the hero—the American conductor—goes to the Soviet village. The Russian villages are something—so miserable and so filthy. They were even before the revolution. They weren't much even then. What they have become now I am afraid to think. You have all read about the program for the collectivization of the farms in 1933, at which time the Soviet Government admits that 3,000,000 peasants died of starvation. Other people claim there were seven and a half million, but 3,000,000 is the figure

admitted by the Soviet Government as the figure of people who died of starvation, planned by the government in order to drive people into collective farms. That is a recorded historical fact.

Now, here is the life in the Soviet village as presented in *Song of Russia*. You see the happy peasants. You see they are meeting the hero at the station with bands, with beautiful blouses and shoes, such as they never wore anywhere. You see children with operetta costumes on them and with a brass band which they could never afford. You see the manicured starlets driving tractors and the happy women who come from work singing. You see a peasant at home with a close-up of food for which anyone there would have been murdered. If anybody had such food in Russia in that time he couldn't remain alive, because he would have been torn apart by neighbors trying to get food. But here is a close-up of it and a line where Robert Taylor comments on the food and the peasant answers, "This is just a simple country table and the food we eat ourselves."

Then the peasant proceeds to show Taylor how they live. He shows him his wonderful tractor. It is parked somewhere in his private garage. He shows him the grain in his bin, and Taylor says, "That is wonderful grain." Now, it is never said that the peasant does not own this tractor or this grain because it is a collective farm. He couldn't have it. It is not his. But the impression he gives to Americans, who wouldn't know any differently, is that certainly it is this peasant's private property, and that is how he lives, he has his own tractor and his own grain. Then it shows miles and miles of plowed fields.

The CHAIRMAN. We will have more order, please.

MISS RAND. Am I speaking too fast?

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

MISS RAND. Then——

MR. STRIPLING. Miss Rand, may I bring up one point there?

MISS RAND. Surely.

MR. STRIPLING. I saw the picture. At this peasant's village or home, was there a priest or several priests in evidence?

MISS RAND. Oh, yes; I am coming to that, too. The priest was from the beginning in the village scenes, having a position as sort of a constant companion and friend of the peasants, as if religion was a natural accepted part of that life. Well, now, as a matter of fact, the situation about religion in Russia in my time was, and I understand it still is, that for a Communist Party member to have anything to do with religion means expulsion from the party. He is not allowed to enter a church or take part in any religious ceremony. For a private citizen, that is a nonparty member, it was permitted, but it was so frowned upon that people had to keep it secret, if they went to church. If they wanted a church wedding they usually had it privately in their homes, with only a few friends present, in order not to let it be known at their place of employment because, even though it was not forbidden, the chances were that they would be thrown out of a job for being known as practicing any kind of religion.

Now, then, to continue with the story, Robert Taylor proposes to the heroine. She accepts him. They have a wedding, which, of course, is a church wedding. It takes place with all the religious pomp which they show. They have a banquet. They have dancers, in something like satin skirts and performing ballets such as you never could possibly see in any village and certainly not in Russia. Later they show

a peasants' meeting place, which is a kind of a marble palace with crystal chandeliers. Where they got it or who built it for them I would like to be told. Then later you see that the peasants all have radios. When the heroine plays as a soloist with Robert Taylor's orchestra, after she marries him, you see a scene where all the peasants are listening on radios, and one of them says, "There are more than millions listening to the concert."

I don't know whether there are a hundred people in Russia, private individuals, who own radios. And I remember reading in the newspaper at the beginning of the war that every radio was seized by the Government and people were not allowed to own them. Such an idea that every farmer, a poor peasant, has a radio, is certainly preposterous. You also see that they have long-distance telephones. Later in the picture Taylor has to call his wife in the village by long-distance telephone. Where they got this long-distance phone, I don't know.

Now, here comes the crucial point of the picture. In the midst of this concert, when the heroine is playing, you see a scene on the border of the U. S. S. R. You have a very lovely modernistic sign saying "U. S. S. R." I would just like to remind you that that is the border where probably thousands of people have died trying to escape out of this lovely paradise. It shows the U. S. S. R. sign, and there is a border guard standing. He is listening to the concert. Then there is a scene inside kind of a guardhouse where the guards are listening to the same concert, the beautiful Tschaiowsky music, and they are playing chess. Suddenly there is a Nazi attack on them. The poor, sweet Russians were unprepared. Now, realize—and that was a great shock to me—that the border that was being shown was the border of Poland. That was the border of an occupied, destroyed, enslaved country which Hitler and Stalin destroyed together. That was the border that was being shown to us—just a happy place with people listening to music.

Also realize that when all this sweetness and light was going on in the first part of the picture, with all these happy, free people, there was not a GPU agent among them, with no food lines, no persecution—complete freedom and happiness, with everybody smiling. Incidentally, I have never seen so much smiling in my life, except on the murals of the world's fair pavilion of the Soviet. If any one of you have seen it, you can appreciate it. It is one of the stock propaganda tricks of the Communists, to show these people smiling. That is all they can show. You have all this, plus the fact that an American conductor had accepted an invitation to come there and conduct a concert, and this took place in 1941 when Stalin was the ally of Hitler. That an American would accept an invitation to that country was shocking to me, with everything that was shown being proper and good and all those happy people going around dancing, when Stalin was an ally of Hitler.

Now, then, the heroine decides that she wants to stay in Russia. Taylor would like to take her out of the country, but she says no, her place is here, she has to fight the war. Here is the line, as nearly exact as I could mark it while watching the picture: "I have a great responsibility to my family, to my village, and to the way I have lived." What way had she lived? This is just a polite way of saying the Communist way of life. She goes on to say that she wants to stay in the country because otherwise, "How can I help to build a

better and better life for my country." What do you mean when you say better and better? That means she has already helped to build a good way. That is the Soviet Communist way. But now she wants to make it even better. All right.

Now, then, Taylor's manager, who is played, I believe, by Benchley, an American, tells her that she should leave the country, but when she refuses and wants to stay, here is the line he uses: He tells her in an admiring friendly way that "You are a fool, but a lot of fools like you died on the village green at Lexington."

Now, I submit that that is blasphemy, because the men at Lexington were not fighting just a foreign invader. They were fighting for freedom and what I mean—and I intend to be exact—is they were fighting for political freedom and individual freedom. They were fighting for the rights of man. To compare them to somebody, anybody fighting for a slave state, I think is dreadful.

Then, later the girl also says—I believe this was she or one of the other characters—that "the culture we have been building here will never die." What culture? The culture of concentration camps.

At the end of the picture one of the Russians asks Taylor and the girl to go back to America, because they can help them there. How? Here is what he says, "You can go back to your country and tell them what you have seen and you will see the truth both in speech and in music." Now, that is plainly saying that what you have seen is the truth about Russia. That is what is in the picture.

Now, here is what I cannot understand at all: If the excuse that has been given here is that we had to produce the picture in wartime, just how can it help the war effort? If it is to deceive the American people, if it were to present to the American people a better picture of Russia than it really is, then that sort of an attitude is nothing but the theory of the Nazi elite, that a choice group of intellectual or other leaders will tell the people lies for their own good. That I don't think is the American way of giving people information. We do not have to deceive the people at any time, in war or peace.

If it was to please the Russians, I don't see how you can please the Russians by telling them that we are fools. To what extent we have done it, you can see right now. You can see the results right now. If we present a picture like that as our version of what goes on in Russia, what will they think of it? We don't win anybody's friendship. We will only win their contempt, and as you know the Russians have been behaving like this.

My whole point about the picture is this: I fully believe Mr. Mayer when he says that he did not make a Communist picture. To do him justice, I can tell you I noticed, by watching the picture, where there was an effort to cut propaganda out. I believe he tried to cut propaganda out of the picture, but the terrible thing is the carelessness with ideas, not realizing that the mere presentation of that kind of happy existence in a country of slavery and horror is terrible because it is propaganda. You are telling people that it is all right to live in a totalitarian state.

Now, I would like to say that nothing on earth will justify slavery. In war or peace or at any time you cannot justify slavery. You cannot tell people that it is all right to live under it and that everybody there is happy.

If you doubt this, I will just ask you one question. Visualize a picture in your own mind as laid in Nazi Germany. If anybody laid a plot just based on a pleasant little romance in Germany and played Wagner music and said that people are just happy there, would you say that that was propaganda or not, when you know what life in Germany was and what kind of concentration camps they had there. You would not dare to put just a happy love story into Germany, and for every one of the same reasons you should not do it about Russia.

MR. STRIMLING. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

MR. WOOD. I gather, then, from your analysis of this picture your personal criticism of it is that it overplayed the conditions that existed in Russia at the time the picture was made; is that correct?

MISS RAND. Did you say overplayed?

MR. WOOD. Yes.

MISS RAND. Well, the story portrayed the people.

MR. WOOD. It portrayed the people of Russia in a better economic and social position than they occupied?

MISS RAND. That is right.

MR. WOOD. And it would also leave the impression in the average mind that they were better able to resist the aggression of the German Army than they were in fact able to resist?

MISS RAND. Well, that was not in the picture. So far as the Russian war was concerned, not very much was shown about it.

MR. WOOD. Well, you recall, I presume—it is a matter of history—going back to the middle of the First World War when Russia was also our ally against the same enemy that we were fighting at this time and they were knocked out of the war. When the remnants of their forces turned against us, it prolonged the First World War a considerable time, didn't it?

MISS RAND. I don't believe so.

MR. WOOD. You don't?

MISS RAND. No.

MR. WOOD. Do you think, then, that it was to our advantage or to our disadvantage to keep Russia in this war, at the time this picture was made?

MISS RAND. That has absolutely nothing to do with what we are discussing.

MR. WOOD. Well——

MISS RAND. But if you want me to answer, I can answer, but it will take me a long time to say what I think, as to whether we should or should not have had Russia on our side in the war. I can, but how much time will you give me?

MR. WOOD. Well, do you say that it would have prolonged the war, so far as we were concerned, if they had been knocked out of it at that time?

MISS RAND. I can't answer that yes or no, unless you give me time for a long speech on it.

MR. WOOD. Well, there is a pretty strong probability that we wouldn't have won it at all, isn't there?

MISS RAND. I don't know, because on the other hand I think we could have used the lend-lease supplies that we sent there to much better advantage ourselves.

Mr. WOOD. Well, at that time——

Miss RAND. I don't know. It is a question.

Mr. WOOD. We were furnishing Russia with all the lend-lease equipment that our industry would stand, weren't we?

Miss RAND. That is right.

Mr. WOOD. And continued to do it?

Miss RAND. I am not sure it was at all wise. Now, if you want to discuss my military views—I am not an authority, but I will try.

Mr. WOOD. What do you interpret, then, the picture as having been made for?

Miss RAND. I ask you: What relation could a lie about Russia have with the war effort? I would like to have somebody explain that to me, because I really don't understand it, why a lie would help anybody or why it would keep Russia in or out of the war. How?

Mr. WOOD. You don't think it would have been of benefit to the American people to have kept them in?

Miss RAND. I don't believe the American people should ever be told any lies, publicly or privately. I don't believe that lies are practical. I think the international situation now rather supports me. I don't think it was necessary to deceive the American people about the nature of Russia.

I could add this: If those who saw it say it was quite all right, and perhaps there are reasons why it was all right to be an ally of Russia, then why weren't the American people told the real reasons and told that Russia is a dictatorship but there are reasons why we should cooperate with them to destroy Hitler and other dictators? All right, there may be some argument to that. Let us hear it. But of what help can it be to the war effort to tell people that we should associate with Russia and that she is not a dictatorship?

Mr. WOOD. Let me see if I understand your position. I understand, from what you say, that because they were a dictatorship we shouldn't have accepted their help in undertaking to win a war against another dictatorship.

Miss RAND. That is not what I said. I was not in a position to make that decision. If I were, I would tell you what I would do. That is not what we are discussing. We are discussing the fact that our country was an ally of Russia, and the question is, What should we tell the American people about it—the truth or a lie? If we had good reason, if that is what you believe, all right, then why not tell the truth? Say it is a dictatorship, but we want to be associated with it. Say it is worth while being associated with the devil, as Churchill said, in order to defeat another evil which is Hitler. There might be some good argument made for that. But why pretend that Russia was not what it was?

Mr. WOOD. Well——

Miss RAND. What do you achieve by that?

Mr. WOOD. Do you think it would have had as good an effect upon the morale of the American people to preach a doctrine to them that Russia was on the verge of collapse?

Miss RAND. I don't believe that the morale of anybody can be built up by a lie. If there was nothing good that we could truthfully say about Russia, then it would have been better not to say anything at all.

Mr. WOOD. Well——

Miss RAND. You don't have to come out and denounce Russia during the war; no. You can keep quiet. There is no moral guilt in not saying something if you can't say it, but there is in saying the opposite of what is true.

Mr. WOOD. Thank you. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. You paint a very dismal picture of Russia. You made a great point about the number of children who were unhappy. Doesn't anybody smile in Russia any more?

Miss RAND. Well, if you ask me literally, pretty much no.

Mr. McDOWELL. They don't smile?

Miss RAND. Not quite that way; no. If they do, it is privately and accidentally. Certainly, it is not social. They don't smile in approval of their system.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, all they do is talk about food.

Miss RAND. That is right.

Mr. McDOWELL. That is a great change from the Russians I have always known, and I have know a lot of them. Don't they do things at all like Americans? Don't they walk across town to visit their mother-in-law or somebody?

Miss RAND. Look, it is very hard to explain. It is almost impossible to convey to a free people what it is like to live in a totalitarian dictatorship. I can tell you a lot of details. I can never completely convince you, because you are free. It is in a way good that you can't even conceive of what it is like. Certainly they have friends and mothers-in-law. They try to live a human life, but you understand it is totally inhuman. Try to imagine what it is like if you are in constant terror from morning till night and at night you are waiting for the doorbell to ring, where you are afraid of anything and everybody, living in a country where human life is nothing, less than nothing, and you know it. You don't know who or when is going to do what to you because you may have friends who spy on you, where there is no law and any rights of any kind.

Mr. McDOWELL. You came here in 1926, I believe you said. Did you escape from Russia?

Miss RAND. No.

Mr. McDOWELL. Did you have a passport?

Miss RAND. No. Strangely enough, they gave me a passport to come out here as a visitor.

Mr. McDOWELL. As a visitor?

Miss RAND. It was at a time when they relaxed their orders a little bit. Quite a few people got out. I had some relatives here and I was permitted to come here for a year. I never went back.

Mr. McDOWELL. I see.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

The first witness tomorrow morning will be Adolph Menjou.

(Whereupon, at 4:20 p. m., an adjournment was taken until 10:30 a. m. of the following day, Tuesday, October 21, 1947.)¹⁸

¹⁸ See appendix, p. 525, for exhibit 26.

HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

The first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. The first witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Mr. Adolph Menjou.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Menjou, will you please stand and raise your right hand.

Mr. Menjou, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MENJOU. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please, Mr. Menjou.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, will you let the record show that a subcommittee is present?

The CHAIRMAN. The record will show that a subcommittee is present, consisting of Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, Mr. Nixon, and Mr. Thomas.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator, Messrs. Louis J. Russell, Robert B. Gaston, H. A. Smith, investigators, and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

TESTIMONY OF ADOLPH MENJOU

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, will you please state your name and address?

Mr. MENJOU. My name is Adolph Menjou, and my address is 722 North Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, do you desire counsel?

Mr. MENJOU. No, sir; I have no need of counsel. I think I can speak for myself.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are here before the committee in response to a subpoena which was served upon you on September 29; is that true?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir. I have a copy of it here. The promise is hereby fulfilled.

Mr. STRIPLING. I ask that this be made a part of the record, Mr. Chairman.¹⁹

¹⁹ See appendix, p. 525, for exhibit 27.

The CHAIRMAN. It is so ordered.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, what is your occupation?

Mr. MENJOU. I am a motion-picture actor, I hope.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Menjou?

Mr. MENJOU. I was born in Pittsburgh, Pa., February 18, 1890.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MENJOU. Thirty-four years.

Mr. STRIPLING. And how long have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. MENJOU. Twenty-seven years.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, were you in the First World War?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. In the armed services?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir. I served abroad for 2 years. I was in the Army 3 years, 1 year in America. I served in Italy, with the Italian Army, being attached to the Italian Army; attached to the French Army; and with the Fifth Division until the surrender on November 11, 1918.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you in World War II?

Mr. MENJOU. I served 6 months with the U. S. Camp Shows, Inc., entertaining troops—for 4 months in England, 2 months in North Africa, Sicily, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, Brazil, and the Caribbean.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, have you made a study of the subject of communism, the activities of the Communists, in any particular field in the United States?

Mr. MENJOU. I have. I have made a more particular study of Marxism, Fabian socialism, communism, Stalinism, and its probable effects on the American people, if they ever gain power here.

Mr. STRIPLING. Based upon your study, have you observed any Communist activity in the motion-picture industry or in Hollywood, as we commonly refer to it?

Mr. MENJOU. I would like to get the terminologies completely straight. Communistic activities—I would rather phrase it un-American or subversive, antifree enterprise, anticapitalistic. I have seen—pardon me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you observed any Communist propaganda in pictures, or un-American propaganda in pictures which were produced in Hollywood?

Mr. MENJOU. I have seen no communistic propaganda in pictures—if you mean “vote for Stalin,” or that type of communistic propaganda. I don’t think that the Communists are stupid enough to try it that way. I have seen in certain pictures things I didn’t think should have been in the pictures.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you tell the committee whether or not there has been an effort on the part of any particular group in the motion-picture industry to inject Communist propaganda into pictures or to leave out scenes or parts of stories which would serve the Communist Party line?

Mr. MENJOU. I don’t like that term “Communist propaganda,” because I have seen no such thing as Communist propaganda, such as waving the hammer and sickle in motion pictures. I have seen things that I thought were against what I considered good Americanism, in my feeling. I have seen pictures I thought shouldn’t have been made—shouldn’t have been made, let me put it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt just a minute. I want the record to show that Mr. Wood is here. We now have a quorum of the full committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, do you have any particular pictures in mind—

Mr. MENJOU. Well—

Mr. STRIPLING. When you make that statement?

Mr. MENJOU. Well, I wonder if I could preface it by a short statement?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes, if you please.

Mr. MENJOU. I am not here to smear. I am here to defend the industry, that I have spent the greater part of my life in. I am here to defend the producers and the motion-picture industry.

Now, you wanted me to name a picture?

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt before you name a picture?

Mr. MENJOU. I am sorry.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say that the committee is, also, not here to smear the industry or to smear people working in the industry. The committee wants to get the facts, and only the facts. We are going to hear both sides of all of these questions. We want to make it very clear that the committee is not out to censor the screen.

Proceed, Mr. Menjou.

Mr. MENJOU. Will you repeat the question, please?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. Well, we will approach it this way. We have had testimony here to the effect that writers who were members of the Screen Writers Guild have attempted to inject un-American propaganda into motion pictures. Are you aware that that is the case, or has been the case, in Hollywood at any time?

Mr. MENJOU. I don't think that I am competent to answer that question. I am a member of the Screen Actors Guild, and I think a member of the Screen Writers Guild would be far more competent to answer that. If you want to ask me if I know of any un-American propaganda in any pictures that I appeared, I will be glad to give you my thoughts.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give an example?

Mr. MENJOU. I don't think the picture *Mission to Moscow* should have been made. It was a perfectly completely dishonest picture. If it was to have been an adaptation of the book by Mr. Davies it should have included the entire story in Moscow, including the Moscow trials where Mr. Davies was a witness and over which Mr. Vishinsky presided. That was not in the picture. Therefore, I consider that a completely dishonest picture and distortion of the adaptation of the book.

I also do not think that the picture *North Star* was a true picture, from what I have been able to learn after reading over 150 books on the subject. This was a picture showing the German attack on the Russians and certain parts of it were not true. It has been quite some time ago since I saw the picture. I thought that picture would have been better unmade. Fortunately, those pictures were unsuccessful.

Mr. STRIPLING. As a generality, would you say that the more entertaining the picture is, the better opportunity there might be to put across propaganda?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes. The better the entertainment the more dangerous the propaganda becomes, once it is injected into the picture.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know of any anti-Communist pictures that are being produced in Hollywood at the present time?

Mr. MENJOU. No, sir; I do not. And I would like to see one. I think the producers of anti-Fascist pictures should turn around and make an anti-Communist picture. I believe it would be an enormous success, if it were made.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, if a picture is produced, as for example Mission to Moscow, which gives a false portrayal or which has propaganda in it, who do you hold responsible in your own mind as a veteran actor in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MENJOU. Well, I believe that the manufacturer of any product is responsible in the end for the quality of his product.

Mr. STRIPLING. In other words, the producers would be held responsible?

Mr. MENJOU. They should be.

Mr. STRIPLING. What do you think could be done to correct that?

Mr. MENJOU. I think a great deal already has been done. The eternal vigilance of the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals, by its vigilance, has prevented an enormous amount of sly, subtle, un-American class-struggle propaganda from going into pictures.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you consider that the alliance is doing a good job; that is, has been doing a good job?

Mr. MENJOU. I think they have done a magnificent job, and I am very proud to be a member of the board of directors.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Actors Guild?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever noticed any effort on the part of Communist individuals to gain influence in the Screen Actors Guild?

Mr. MENJOU. I don't know any members of the Screen Actors Guild who are members of the Communist Party. I have never seen their cards. I am a firm believer that the Communist Party in the United States is a direct branch of the Comintern—which, in my opinion, has never been dissolved—direct from Moscow. It is an oriental tyranny, a Kremlin-dominated conspiracy, and it is against the interests of the people to admit that they are Communists. Very few admit it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have your very definite suspicions about some members of the Screen Actors Guild?

Mr. MENJOU. I know a great many people who act an awful lot like Communists.

Mr. STRIPLING. As an actor, Mr. Menjou, could you tell the committee whether or not an actor in a picture could portray a scene which would in effect serve as propaganda for communism or any other un-American purpose?

Mr. MENJOU. Oh, yes. I believe that under certain circumstances a communistic director, a communistic writer, or a communistic actor, even if he were under orders from the head of the studio not to inject communism or un-Americanism or subversion into pictures, could easily subvert that order, under the proper circumstances, by a look, by an inflection, by a change in the voice. I think it could be easily done. I have never seen it done, but I think it could be done.

Mr. STRIPLING. You don't know of any examples?

Mr. MENJOU. I cannot think of one at the moment, no, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know Mr. John Cromwell?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. He was identified before the committee yesterday by Mr. Sam Wood as being one who sought to put the Screen Directors Guild into the Red river. Do you consider Mr. Cromwell to be a Communist?

Mr. MENJOU. I don't know whether he is a Communist or not.

Mr. STRIPLING. Does he act like one?

Mr. MENJOU. In my opinion, he acts an awful lot like one.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did he ever make any statement to you relative to his—

Mr. MENJOU. Mr. Cromwell, in his own house, said to me that capitalism in America was through and I would see the day when it was ended in America. A very strange statement from a man who earns upward of \$250,000 a year, who owns a great deal of Los Angeles and Hollywood real estate. It is rather difficult to reconcile that. He is profiting by the capitalistic system, and yet he is against it. He told me so with his own lips.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know Mr. Herbert K. Sorrell?

Mr. MENJOU. I do not know Mr. Sorrell.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know who he is, however?

Mr. MENJOU. I know who he is.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you identify him for the committee?

Mr. MENJOU. Mr. Sorrell, I believe, is head of the painters' union. I think he is also the head of the Conference of Studio Unions.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, what have been your observations regarding Communist activity in Hollywood in the past 10 years? We received testimony yesterday that their activity increased after 1936.

Mr. MENJOU. Well, I became very much interested as to what socialism was during the last war, when I was stationed in the birth-place of Karl Marx with the Fifth Division. It interested me greatly. I did a considerable amount of reading. I tried to wade through *Das Kapital*. It was a very difficult job. I read the Max Eastman condensation of it. When I got to California later, we heard very, very little about it. Socialism at that time was spoken of. It had very few followers in this country. About 1932 or 1933, when the Russian question began to loom in the picture, with the mass starvations of the poor Russian peasants because they would not conform to the demands of Mr. Stalin—why, they shocked the world with the testimony of some of the witnesses.

Then, later on, identified by various committees, groups began to be formed, which have been labeled, and I think documented, as being communistic front organizations. I particularly refer to the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. This was labeled a Communist front organization. I understand that at a meeting of the board of directors it refused to make an anti-Communist statement, that they were anti-Communist, whereupon there were wholesale desertions. One of the first was the president, Mr. James Roosevelt. He left the thing just prior to the elections. Then there were many, many other people who left. Those people who still remained in it, in my opinion, would be pro-Communist.

I do not understand any other reason for a person belonging to an organization in which he knew Communists were in and were dominating.

Then the PCA was formed. It also refused to come out with an anti-Communist platform, whereupon the ADA, the Americans for Democratic Action, was formed, I believe by Mrs. Roosevelt, Leon Henderson, Melvin Douglas, and some other people. They do not permit Communists in their organization, I understand.

I wonder if I can help you any more.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. Now, these various front organizations, which have sprung up in Hollywood—

Mr. MENJOU. There is the American Youth for Democracy, which is the new name for the Young Communist League.

I am not an expert on the organizations here in America, although I have a list of names here which I have gathered and will be glad to produce.

Mr. STRIPLING. Let me ask you this: The committee has evidence that there have been numerable Communist front organizations mushroom in Hollywood. We received testimony yesterday from Mr. Wood to the effect that they set up an organization, and after they milk it dry they form another one. In the Screen Actors Guild, have there ever been any resolutions offered by any of the members which had as their purpose to aid these front organizations?

Mr. MENJOU. I was one of the founders of the Screen Actors Guild. I think my number is among the first 50. I served for many years on its board, but I have not been active in any of the board of directors' meetings for some 7, 8, or 9 years, so I couldn't make a statement on that. I couldn't answer that question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, let me ask you this—

Mr. MENJOU. I think a member of the board of directors would be far more capable of answering that question than myself.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. Mr. Chairman, we will have officials of the Screen Actors Guild before the committee later in the week.

As a student of communism, did you note an increased alliance with the Communists in Hollywood during the period of the war emergency, when we had a military allied relationship with the Soviet Union?

Mr. MENJOU. Well, I spent practically 7 months out of every year after Pearl Harbor away, and I was not in Hollywood most of that time. I find it rather difficult to answer that question. Maybe you could rephrase it and I could answer it. I was—

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you say that Communist activity increased?

Mr. MENJOU. Oh, yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. In Hollywood after Pearl Harbor, 1941? Was it intensified?

Mr. MENJOU. It was intensified with the nonaggression pact between Mr. Molotov and Mr. Von Ribbentrop.

Mr. STRIPLING. Weren't some—

Mr. MENJOU. I believe the date was in 1939.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall some of the figures in Hollywood who were very active in the American Peace Mobilization during that period?

Mr. MENJOU. I do not. I am not familiar with that part of the picture at all. I know the organization by name only, and I could

not tell you the names of that. Someone else who is more familiar with that will have to answer that question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you say the Communists in Hollywood follow the party line, directions laid down by Moscow?

Mr. MENJOU. Rigidly.

Mr. STRIPLING. It is requested in all of their activities there?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you elaborate on that point any, Mr. Menjou?

Mr. MENJOU. I am trying to think how I can help you. We have had a very disastrous strike in Hollywood, and a very long one. It has been going on now for more than a year. Mr. Sorrell is the head of the organization whose members are out on strike. I believe, according to the testimony I have here, that Mr. Sorrell is a member of the Communist Party under the name of Herbert K. Stewart. I have a photostatic copy of the purported Communist card and the sworn testimony of Mr. Sellers, admittedly the world's greatest handwriting expert. Based on the fact, I believe, that Mr. Sorrell is a Communist, I would be very suspicious of any of the people who either stood on a platform with him or supported any of his activities or statements. This strike was a particularly bloody strike.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could the committee have that?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. That photostat.

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. We would like to receive this into evidence, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.²⁰

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know of some of the actors or other people who are prominent in the motion-picture industry who did associate with Mr. Sorrell in his activities?

Mr. MENJOU. I attended a meeting of the entire membership of the Screen Actors Guild. I am not too certain of this date, but it might have been a year ago. The meeting was called in order to try to settle the strike. Now, the board of directors of the Screen Actors Guild had exerted all of their efforts to settle this strike in every way possible. I think a magnificent job was done by the board of directors, particularly Mr. Regan, the president. After long, long deliberations and trips to Chicago and everywhere else, they finally came to the conclusion that it was a jurisdictional strike and could have been settled, but Mr. Sorrell did not want to settle it. That was the conclusion made. This meeting was called by a group of 350 people. I think that is the necessary amount, according to our bylaws, to call such a meeting. Mr. Regan spoke for, I think, more than an hour and a half, explaining the position and the work and the labors that he had gone through to try to determine who was right or who was wrong, because there was an effort being made to call all the actors out on strike, which would have thrown some thirty-odd-thousand people out of work.

Now, then, that particular evening the opposition wanted to be heard. Mr. Sorrell spoke. Following Mr. Sorrell appeared Mr. Edward G. Robinson, Mr. Cronin, Mr. Alexander Knox, and Mr. Paul Henreid. They all admitted what a wonderful job Mr. Regan had done, but they wanted the strike settled on Mr. Sorrell's side, which,

²⁰ See appendix, p. 525, for exhibit 28.

in my opinion, would have meant more trouble, more chaos, and no solution to the trouble, excepting that the unions would have been under the complete domination of the Communist Party. That is my opinion.

I think sanity prevailed. There was a motion presented by myself that the membership stand by its duly elected board of directors, which was majority voted, and the meeting was over.

Now, I personally would never have been seen with Mr. Sorrell if I could help it. He is responsible for the most incredible brutality—beatings, the overturning of cars on private property in front of the Warner Bros. studio, shocking parades, where one man almost lost an eye in front of the MGM studio—a most outrageous performance and violation of the picketing laws in California.

I think he did everything possible to embarrass the producers. I don't believe the Communist Party has any intention of ever having any peace of any kind, and I would regret the day that a man of Mr. Sorrell's characteristics should ever be in charge of the labor unions in California. God help us if he ever does.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you know Mr. John Howard Lawson?

MR. MENJOU. I do not.

MR. STRIPLING. Have you heard of him?

MR. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you know him by reputation?

MR. MENJOU. Only by hearsay.

MR. STRIPLING. Have you ever heard a charge that he was head of the Communist Party in Hollywood?

MR. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

MR. STRIPLING. He directed their affairs?

MR. MENJOU. I have heard that, but I cannot testify to it because I do not know.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not he participated in the picket line at Warner Bros. studio, when the cars were overturned?

MR. MENJOU. I do not know that; I am sorry.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, what do you think is the best way to go about combating communism in Hollywood?

MR. MENJOU. Well, I think a great deal already has been done. The first meeting of this committee has already alerted many apathetic people, many people who are not aware of the incredibly serious menace that faces America. They don't take the trouble to read. I am sure that some of my fellow actors who have attacked this committee and myself had they taken the time to read and study would be of exactly the same opinion as I am. I believe that 95 percent of the people in California are decent, honest American citizens. The Communist Party is a minority, but a dangerous minority. I believe that the entire Nation should be alerted to its menace today. In my opinion, the Comintern has never been dissolved and the new Cominform which meets in Belgrade is simply an opening. No one seems to know why they have come out into the open. They have always been underground before. The proof that they are in existence is the letter from Mr. DuBois, the pastry cook, one of the heads of the Communist Party, wrote to the Communist Party in New York, which was published in the Daily Worker, forced Mr. Browder, the former head of the Communist Party, out of the party. Presumably Mr. Browder

had no trouble getting a passport to go to Moscow and returned to represent the Communist book trust in New York. I don't think anybody is being fooled by this. But the American people are not alert. If a Gallup poll in California shows that 50 percent of the people have never heard of the Taft-Hartley bill, you can imagine how apathetic and how ignorant most of them are of this subject.

I have a list of books here—I published a list of over 35 books—and if you will bear with me and if I have the time I would like to read a list of books which I would advise every man, woman, and child in America to read. They will then get a picture of this oriental tyranny, this Communist-dominated conspiracy to take the world over by force. It will take the words out of Mr. Lenin's mouth, out of Mr. Stalin's mouth. Mr. Molotov is a member of the Politburo. Mr. Vishinsky I consider simply a puppet.

First, I would like to ask them to read *Das Kapital*, by Karl Marx; then the Max Eastman condensation; then a magnificent book called *The Red Prussian*; *The Dream We Lost*, by Fred A. Utley; *Report on Russians*, by Paul Winton, who spent 14 years in Moscow as a correspondent; *Towards Soviet America*, by William Z. Foster, present head of the Communist Party in America, where on page 275 he advocates the liquidation of the American Legion, the rotary clubs, all fraternal organizations, arming of the farmers and arming of the workers, with a dictatorship of the proletariat to take America over by force. That is page 275 of *Towards Soviet America*. You will have trouble getting the book. You will have to advertise for it.

Yogi and the Commissar, by Arthur Koestler, one of the magnificent writers living today who was a Communist member of the party. He spent a great deal of time in Russia. *Dark Side of the Moon*. I defy anyone to read that without being frightened to death. That is a documentary testimony, edited by T. S. Elliott, of the 1,750,000, estimated, Poles, innocent Polish people taken into concentration camps by the Russians in early 1939. The three books by Mr. Dallin, particularly his book, which will be in *Look* magazine, *Slave Labor in Communist Russia*. Over at Uncle Joe's, a magnificent book by Atkinson; *Russian Report*, by William White; *I Chose Freedom*, by Victor Kravchenko; *One Who Survived: Why They Behave Like Russians*, by Fisher; *In Search of Soviet Gold*, by Littlepage; and one of the best books of all, *Pattern for World Revolution*, written anonymously.

This is only a very, very small list of books, but I guarantee you that anyone that reads them will fear for the safety of America.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, yesterday Mr. Wood, Mr. Sam Wood, testified that he considered members of the Communist Party in this country to be the agents of a foreign principal. Do you share that opinion with Mr. Wood?

Mr. MENJOU. The members of the Communist Party in the United States unquestionably, in my mind, are agents of the Comintern in Moscow or the Cominform in Belgrade, or wherever it is. The papers found, on I think it was Professor May, who is now in jail, the Polish-born member of the Canadian Parliament, would prove to me conclusively that the Comintern has never stopped working. This was a sop to America.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you consider that the Communist Party members in this country are engaged in treasonable activities?

Mr. MENJOU. Definitely.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, this committee also has a legislative function as well as an investigative function. During this session there were two bills introduced which sought to outlaw the Communist Party. Do you think that the Communist Party should be outlawed by legislation?

Mr. MENJOU. I believe that the Communist Party in the United States should be outlawed by the Congress of the United States. It is not a political party. It is a conspiracy to take over our Government by force, which would enslave the American people, as the Soviet Government—14 members of the Politburo—hold the Russian people in abject slavery. Any one of a dozen books will prove it. This is not hearsay. Dozens of other testimony will prove what horrors are going on in Russia today, so horrible that you cannot read them without becoming ill.

Now, we don't want that here.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Menjou, there has been quite a bit said and written in the Communist publications and certain left-wing organizations have circulated pamphlets to the effect that this committee is trying to bring about thought control.

Mr. MENJOU. Well, I also have heard many other words—"witch-hunting." I am a witch-hunter if the witches are Communists. I am a Red-baiter. I make no bones about it whatsoever. I would like to see them all back in Russia. I think a taste of Russia would cure many of them. Unfortunately, people in Europe who have not faced the Russians do not realize the method. That is one of the great troubles in France. They are faced with French Communists and not Russians. All of those nations—Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Austria, the Russian zone in Germany—that have had to come in contact with the Russian Army realize what a menace this is.

There would have been much more of an overwhelming vote for General De Gaulle if these people realized it. They don't realize it. They don't read. They don't study. The masses of Russian officers who have come to the American headquarters and asked how they can get into America. The escape of the Russian general who is now in Buenos Aires. The capture of the young senior lieutenant who tried to commit suicide rather than to return to his country. With the hundreds of suicides of those who faced return there, I think it is shocking that the United States should ever return anybody back to the Soviet Union.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Menjou, yesterday there was placed in the record the salaries of three writers who were employed in the motion-picture industry, whose salaries exceeded \$70,000 per year. They had been identified as Communists, and the committee had records concerning these three men. How do you account for a person who would have such an income subscribing to the Communist philosophy?

Mr. MENJOU. Well, Frederick Engels, who supported Karl Marx his entire life, was a millionaire. He had a very large textile factory in Germany and a very large one in England. We find crackpots everywhere. We have in California what I call the lunatic fringe, the political idiots, the morons, the dangerous Communists, and those who have yet to be convinced. I don't accuse anybody, because we are

curing people every day. There has been an amazing change in Hollywood in the attitude of many people since this committee has started to function and also due to the activities of the Motion Picture Alliance. These people only have to be told and have to see. The only dangerous one is the hard, disciplined core of the Communist Party themselves. These people I do not know. I have never seen one. The only Communist I ever met was Mr. Maisky, the Ambassador to London, and I fear he has either been liquidated or shunted off somewhere for some deviation. His name has disappeared completely from the newspapers.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, those are all the questions I have at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Menjou, do I understand from your testimony that it is your opinion that the producers themselves and the responsible studio heads in Hollywood are not communistic?

Mr. MENJOU. They are as fine a group of men as I ever met. I have worked with them for 34 years, and I don't think any of them are Communists. I think due to the fact that the Communist Party in America is a legal party has prevented them from taking certain action against very excellent writers. There are some very excellent writers among those leftist writers. They don't have to always write communistically, at all. Some of them have contributed much to some of our finest motion pictures, in which there was no communism whatsoever.

I think the producers in California, as I say, are as patriotic a group of Americans as you will meet anywhere.

Mr. WOOD. It was suggested yesterday in the testimony of one of the witnesses by a member of the committee that the producers themselves should get together and by concerted action eliminate these people who are affected with Communist tendencies from the industry. Do you agree with me that that would involve or not involve some very serious legal implications?

Mr. MENJOU. I believe it would.

Mr. WOOD. Under existing law?

Mr. MENJOU. I spoke to Senator Taft about that the other day, and he agreed also.

Mr. WOOD. Would you then feel that a recommendation to the Congress by this committee to so modify existing law as to permit just that to be done would have a wholesale effect?

Mr. MENJOU. Mr. Wood, I feel this way: If the Communists would come out in the open, let us know who they are, because they can be watched. I am told by Mr. Edgar Hoover, who is a very close personal friend of mine, that he is against driving the Communist Party underground. They are now underground. I want to bring them out so we can see who they are. I feel, about pictures, that propaganda pictures should be labeled propaganda as such and propaganda should be not injected into entertainment. I feel that if an anti-Fascist picture is made, an anti-Communist picture should be made next, because I am anti-Fascist as well as I am anti-Communist. The German-American Bund was driven underground, if you want to call it such. I believe all their members are known. But they cannot go on the air. They cannot have meetings. They cannot get con-

verts. Therefore, they are made impotent. I want to know these Communists. We want to see them. I am not afraid of communism in America if it is out in the open. I am not afraid. The American people will reject it openly, if they know what it is. I would like to see it outlawed.

Mr. WOOD. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Menjou, on this matter of outlawing the Communist Party, the party has been outlawed in Canada, Panama, and various other nations of the world. So far as I could study their situations, the results haven't been much different. There are many Communists now in Canada. Canada now faces the business of arresting those that are known Communists and proven Communists. They go through trials. But it hasn't apparently slowed the number of Communists that are in Canada.

Mr. MENJOU. You are not going to slow down the hard core of the disciplined Communist. He is going to be there all the time. He simply has to be watched.

To take the producers in the picture business—if I may partially answer Mr. Wood again—a man, let us say, like Mr. Mayer or Mr. Warner, who testified yesterday, it is practically impossible for them to see every foot of film made in their studios. They make too many. They haven't the time. They couldn't possibly do it. Both of them are anti-Communist to the core; that I know. You will see, and have seen, very, very little of what I would call anything like subversion because, as I say, of the activities of the alliance and due to the publicity that has been given out. This publicity is healthy. That is why I am proud to be before the committee, because these things can be heard and brought out. Being so busy that they cannot do it, the under producers in the studio do the engaging of the writers.

Mr. Mayer doesn't hire any writers. That is done by other people. Now, if these people are watched constantly, they can do no harm. They can't do any harm.

I wouldn't want to deprive anybody from making his bread and butter. I think these people can be taught. I think, if their party is outlawed, the thing that worries me about the party is its connection with Moscow, which is dedicated to the overthrow of this Government by force, and every other government. Any study of the situation in Bulgaria, Rumania, or Hungary must appall people. They must frighten them to death. We don't want that here.

If the capitalistic system does as well in the next 50 years as it has done in the last 50, there will be no trouble at all in this country, believe me.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Menjou, I believe I told you last May, on the west coast, that of all the thousands of people I have discussed communism with you have the most profound knowledge of the background of communism I have ever met.

With that knowledge, with your study of Karl Marx and modern communism, I would like to ask another question. There has been a great deal of propaganda in the United States and other countries here in the last 2 years that the Soviet Government has relaxed its opposition to religion—churches. I have even heard speakers from the Soviet Union say that church attendance was encouraged. Do you

think the ardent Soviet Government has changed in any respect from the original Marxian communism?

Mr. MENJOU. I think they were requested. I don't know who made the request. It was somebody from the Government some 4 or 5 years ago that requested they relax their attitude toward religion. The Communist Party itself will never relax it. They are anti-God. They are atheistic, the party itself. The Russian people are deeply, deeply religious people, and their cry for religion is very great. They have been permitted to go to church, yes, but I think that everybody has been watched very carefully. Father Brown, who was the only Catholic priest permitted in Russia for many years, had a small group of people coming to his church. The government itself has never relaxed its attitude toward religion at all.

It is still there in the Red Square that "religion is the opiate of the masses and the Communist Party itself." They have relaxed nothing, nothing. They allow a few more people to go to church, but they watch everybody. The secret police watch the people so carefully that they have complete control over there. They have complete control. The Russian people are completely enslaved.

Mr. Vishinsky is enslaved. Mr. Molotov is enslaved. They are all frightened to death. Mr. Stalin would just as soon kill them as look at them. He killed all his close friends. There is excellent evidence that he poisoned Lenin, Gorky, and that he also executed the pharmacist, the head of the NKVD at the time, who was the witness. He acted very much like Mr. Capone. He committed the murders and then killed the witnesses.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, in addition to being a great American, here is one of the greatest American patriots I have ever met.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Menjou, do you think there is justification for the action of this committee in its instituting an investigation of Communist activities in Hollywood?

Mr. MENJOU. Do I think so? Certainly.

Mr. VAIL. In the daily papers in the past few days I noticed a statement that was signed by a number of prominent Hollywood actors and actresses deploring the investigation and describing it as a smear. What is your impression of the people who were signatory to that statement?

Mr. MENJOU. I am just as shocked and amazed—which I believe were their words—as they said they were shocked and amazed. I don't believe any of them has ever made a serious study of the subject. I believe they are innocent dupes; that is my impression of them, innocent dupes.

I guarantee not one of them could name four men on the Politburo; I guarantee not one of them could name a date or an action against Russia or a violation of the antiaggression pacts which Mr. Stalin violated. If these people will only read and read and read and read, they will wake up. I have all the sympathy in the world for them; I am sorry for them.

Mr. VAIL. I have no more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Menjou, from what you have said to charge a person with being a Communist is a very serious thing?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIXON. You would not want that charge made?

Mr. MENJOU. Without substantiation, that is right. That is playing right into the Communists' hands.

Mr. NIXON. In answer to a question by Mr. Stripling you indicated that although you might not know whether a certain person was a Communist, I think you said he certainly acted like a Communist.

Mr. MENJOU. If you belong to a Communist-front organization and you take no action against the Communists, you do not resign from the organization when you still know the organization is dominated by Communists. I consider that a very, very dangerous thing.

Mr. NIXON. Have you any other tests which you would apply which would indicate to you that people acted like Communists?

Mr. MENJOU. Well, I think attending any meetings at which Mr. Paul Robeson appeared and applauding or listening to his Communist songs in America, I would be ashamed to be seen in an audience doing a thing of that kind.

Mr. NIXON. You indicated you thought a person acted like a Communist when he stated, as one person did to you, that capitalism was through.

Mr. MENJOU. That is not communistic per se, but it is very dangerous leaning, it is very close. I see nothing wrong with the capitalistic system, the new dynamic capitalism in America today. Mr. Stalin was very worried when he talked to Mr. Stassen. He asked him four times when the great crash was coming in America. That is what they are banking on, a great crash, and I do not think it is coming.

Mr. NIXON. You indicated that belonging to a Communist-front organization, in other words, an association with Communists, attending these planned meetings, making statements in opposition to the capitalistic system are three of the tests you would apply.

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIXON. Do you have any other tests from your experience you would like to give this committee?

Mr. MENJOU. I don't know of any better ones.

Mr. NIXON. Do you believe that the motion-picture industry at the present time is doing everything it can to rid itself of subversive un-American influences?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, I do. I believe it has been that way for almost a year, or maybe a little more than a year.

Mr. NIXON. You see no further steps the industry can take at this time that it has not taken in the past?

Mr. MENJOU. Except eternal vigilance that every American and every citizen of the United States should exercise toward communism. I would rather label it as Stalinism; there is no such thing as communism.

Mr. NIXON. Do you feel congressional action is necessary in order to assist the industry in going any further with this campaign?

Mr. MENJOU. This is a secret organization. Very few people admit to being members of it, only a few, and of course their records are disgraceful. Mr. Mate of the French Communist Party was sentenced to 20 years for mutiny; Mr. Torres was sentenced to 6 years for desertion. Mr. Eugene Dennis, one of the members in New York, has a police record in California. I think I would keep away from those kind of people; at least I have been taught that way.

Mr. NIXON. Getting down to specific cases as to what the industry should do——

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIXON. To rid itself of un-American activities in Hollywood if, for example, a producer were to be given unequivocal proof that one of his star actors was a member of the Communist Party do you believe that that producer has the responsibility as an American not to renew that person's contract?

Mr. MENJOU. Well, I would not want to say that. I was one of the persons most deeply shocked when Mr. Cecil B. DeMille was deprived of his job on the radio. I thought that was perfectly shocking. I asked Mr. Cromwell about that and he said, "He is rich." I said, "What has wealth to do with the matter?"

I think Mr. DeMille showed incredible moral courage, more than I have, in giving his job up. He cannot work any more on the radio because he refused to put up a dollar for political purposes. The Taft-Hartley Act has negated all that. I don't believe that an actor, if he is a member of a Communist Party and is careful to state that—I think the public will take care of him.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, you believe the producer in that case would be justified in keeping him in his employment?

Mr. MENJOU. He won't last long if he is labeled as a Communist.

Mr. NIXON. What if a producer is informed that a writer he has in his employ is a member of the Communist Party, what should his action be?

Mr. MENJOU. He could be very carefully watched; this producer could watch every script and every scene of every script. We have many Communist writers who are splendid writers. They do not have to write communistically at all, but they have to be watched.

Mr. NIXON. Your answer would be the same in case he learned that a director or one of the top employees in the particular industry was a member of a Communist Party?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir. I am firmly convinced of the evils of **Stalinism or Marxism**; it is so evil and it is such a menace to the American people that I think it should be watched and watched and watched.

Mr. NIXON. Then so far as your program is concerned, what you advocate is publicity of the fact that certain people in the industry are Communists?

Mr. MENJOU. If they are members of the Communist Party they should say so.

Mr. NIXON. And once that publicity is given by vigilance on the part of the producers and those responsible for the films that go to the public they can see that no un-American propaganda gets into those films?

Mr. MENJOU. Yes, sir. I have no objection, Mr. Nixon, to communistic picture propaganda if it is so labeled an an honest, faithful picture. I would like to see it. I would like to see pictures of the people at the place where Mr. Wallace made his speech; I would like the American people to see that. That would be an honest picture of what is going on in Russia today.

Mr. NIXON. If we refuse to allow a Communist picture to be made and advertised as such we would probably be falling into the same error that we criticize the Communists for in Russia, is that right?

Mr. MENJOU. I agree.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, they will not allow a picture showing the democratic way of life in Russia?

Mr. MENJOU. I also believe the Russians should be treated exactly as they treat us. I would treat them visa for visa. If there are 218 Americans in Moscow today there shouldn't be 3,046 Russians in America because they are all spies, every one of them. There should be 218 Russians in America. Treat them exactly as they treat us. For every American in Moscow we should allow one here. I think we are 2 years late in our firm attitude; we are very far behind.

Mr. NIXON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Menjou, why have no anti-Communist films been made in the United States?

Mr. MENJOU. There are a great many anti-Nazi films made; I do not know. Some have been announced as being in preparation. The title "The Iron Curtain" is, I think, copyrighted by a number of producers. I hope to see that made. I would like to see an honest anti-Communist picture and I would like to see it labeled as such, not as entertainment.

The CHAIRMAN. We heard yesterday from witnesses that at least one, possibly two anti-Communist films were being planned. What have you heard from Hollywood as to the feeling on the part of the producers about producing anti-Communist films?

Mr. MENJOU. I believe they would be an incredible success. After the first picture was made I think there would be many many more made. I think it would be a very wonderful thing to see one made. I would like to see a picture of the Bulgarian situation; I would like to see the execution of Mr. Patkoff by Mr. Dimitrich who was former head of the Comintern. I would like to see that shown to the American public so they can see communism as it actually is.

I would like them to see the brutal beatings, the stabbings, the killings that go on all through Europe with which the Communist Party is facing the people.

We showed many many anti-Nazi pictures. I see no reason why we do not show anti-Communist pictures.

The CHAIRMAN. Why don't we show them?

Mr. MENJOU. I don't know. I hope they are going to show them.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been said in the press by certain individuals in the United States that these hearings now being held by the Un-American Activities Committee are a censorship of the screen. What have you to say about that?

Mr. MENJOU. I think that is juvenile.

The CHAIRMAN. So anybody that would make such a statement would be considered as such?

Mr. MENJOU. It is perfectly infantile to say this committee is trying to control the industry. How could they possibly control the industry? They wouldn't know anything about it. You wouldn't know how to make a picture or anything else. I don't see how that could be said by any man with the intelligence of a louse.

The CHAIRMAN. As a result of testifying here, that is, when the actors testify and when the writers testify, when persons in labor testify, will their testimony and the fact that they have testified before his committee injure their livelihood in any way?

Mr. MENJOU. I shouldn't think it would injure it seriously. I believe there are many people in the picture industry that would not

have me in a picture with them. I think this has gone too far in Hollywood. The line of cleavage is very straight. It isn't like a good Republican or a good Democrat. This is a foul philosophy and it has embittered many many people.

I think Mr. Vishinsky and Mr. Molotov have done a most magnificent job of awakening the American people. The more information the American people get the more they will realize it and the more they will turn against it. It is completely against the American philosophy.

I would move to the State of Texas if it ever came here because I think the Texans would kill them on sight.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard or do you know of any efforts made on the part of anyone to intimidate witnesses that might come before this committee?

Mr. MENJOU. No; I have not. When I went out to campaign for Mr. Dewey and Mr. Bricker in 1944 I was told by various people it would injure my career. I don't think it has and I think I had a right to do it. There is no way of proving that. In Hollywood when your name comes up for a picture you are one of seven or eight actors. I believe a person who was friendly toward communism, a pro-Communist, and who liked the Communist government better than ours, if I came up for a job he would choose another man in preference to me, everything else being equal. I do not consider that a loss of a job, because we lose jobs in many other ways and we get them in many other ways.

Many times we never know when the good part is coming up. Good parts make good actors. The better the part the better the actor.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe, then, it is the patriotic duty of a witness to speak very frankly and freely and he should be pleased to come before the committee and testify?

Mr. MENJOU. Definitely. I believe that any man who is a decent American, who believes in the Constitution of the United States and the free enterprise system which has made this country what it is and which has given its people the highest standard of living of any country on the face of the earth, I believe he should be proud to stand up for it and not be afraid to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any other members of the committee have any questions?

Mr. McDOWELL. I would like to tell Mr. Menjou something to add to his already great knowledge of communism. Recently I have been examining the borders of the United States. I would like to tell you, Mr. Menjou, that within weeks, not months but weeks, bus loads of Communists have crossed the American border.

Mr. MENJOU. That is right. We have no air border patrol, not a sufficient one, and we haven't enough guards. The frontier is very long which we are guarding and it is very easy for people to infiltrate from Mexico over the border.

There was a great, profitable industry in smuggling Chinese over the border. One of my good friends made a great deal of money doing it.

I believe America should arm to the teeth. I believe in universal military training. I attended Culver Military Academy during the last war and enlisted as a private. Due to my military training I was soon made an officer and it taught me a great many things. I believe

if I was told to swim the Mississippi River I would learn how to swim. Every young man should have military training. There is no better thing for a young man than military training for his discipline, for his manhood, for his courage, and for love of his country. I know it was good for me. It never did me any harm.

The CHAIRMAN. Any more questions by the members?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, do you have any more questions?

Mr. STRIPLING. No; no more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Menjou, we thank you very much for coming. We appreciate your being here. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess for 2 minutes.

(A short recess.)

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. Everyone will please be seated.

All right, Mr. Stripling, your next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Jack Moffitt.

The CHAIRMAN. Stand and be sworn, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MOFFITT. I do; yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN CHARLES MOFFITT

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, will you please state your name for the record?

Mr. MOFFITT. John Charles Moffitt.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is M-o-f-f-i-t-t?

Mr. MOFFITT. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are here in response to a subpoena served on you on September 29, Mr. Moffitt?²¹

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present address?

Mr. MOFFITT. 463 South McAddam Place, Los Angeles 5.

Mr. STRIPLING. Please state when and where you were born.

Mr. MOFFITT. I was born in Kansas City, Mo., on May 8, 1901.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

Mr. MOFFITT. For the past 2 years—last year and this year ending in December—I have been the motion-picture critic for Esquire magazine. Prior to that for some 15 years I was motion-picture editor of the Kansas City Star in Kansas City, Mo. I was also a writer on picture subjects for the North American Newspaper Alliance. Through that syndicate my writings on motion-picture subjects have been printed as far as Madras, India, and Rio de Janeiro.

Also during the period I was the American critic for the Era of London, the oldest critic in the British Empire. It is now out of existence.

I am a member of the Screen Writers Guild and accept employment as a scenario writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have been employed by the motion-picture industry as a writer in the past; have you not?

Mr. MOFFITT. Many times.

²¹ See appendix, p. 525, for exhibit 29.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give the committee the various studios at which you have been employed?

Mr. MOFFITT. I have been employed by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, by Paramount, by Republic, and by Warner Bros.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did you first go to Hollywood, Mr. Moffitt?

Mr. MOFFITT. I also have been employed by Universal.

The first time I went to Hollywood was in 1930 and '31 when I was employed by Universal.

Mr. STRIPLING. How many years in all have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. MOFFITT. That would be a little difficult for me to answer without a little calculation.

Mr. STRIPLING. Approximately how many years?

Mr. MOFFITT. I would say around 10 or 12 years. Some of my time in Hollywood was punctuated by a return to journalism in Kansas City.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you ever join any organizations while you were in Hollywood in connection with being a writer for the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; I did. In 1937, shocked by the conduct of the Fascists in Spain, I joined an organization known as the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League. Both my wife and I became members of that organization. We contributed considerable sums of money—for us—to what we supposed was the buying of ambulances and medical supplies for the assistance of the Loyalists in Spain.

After we had been in that organization some months we were invited to what turned out to be a more or less star chamber meeting, an inner corps meeting. It took place in the home of Mr. Frank Tuttle, a director. Mr. Herbert Biberman, who had been responsible for my being in the Anti-Nazi League, was there, as was his wife, Miss Gail Sondergaard, an actress. Donald Ogden Stewart was also one of those present.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Biberman is a director?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. And Mr. Stewart is a writer?

Mr. MOFFITT. Mr. Stewart is a very fine comedy writer.

At this meeting, to our intense surprise, we were addressed as "we Communists." My wife and I always hated communism, as we hated nazism and any other form of dictatorial government, or slave state. We were very shocked.

The purpose of this meeting, I believe, was to raise funds for the Peoples' World, a Communist newspaper. My wife was so indignant that as soon as we got home she tendered her resignation. I was frankly fascinated by the way we had been sucked in, the way a person who hated communism had been, by a pleasant, plausible come-on, induced to participate in a false Communist front.

Mr. STRIPLING. If I understood you correctly, Mr. Biberman is the person who induced you to join the organization originally?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; he did. It didn't take a great deal of inducement because I hated the Nazi then as I do now and I thought the purpose of the organization was stated in its title, the Anti-Nazi League.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you relate to the committee your experiences with the Anti-Nazi League, so far as they deal with any Communist activities?

Mr. MOFFITT. Well, fascinated by the subtlety of this approach, fascinated and, I may say, horrified by the way an innocent liberal was induced to give money to a Communist front and induced to lend what little prestige his name might have professionally to a communistic activity, I remained in about 6 weeks before I resigned, in order to try to see how they worked. I think I learned considerable of their technique in that time.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you give the committee an account of the activities that you observed as a member during those 6 weeks?

Mr. MOFFITT. Well, the most significant activity I observed came out in a conversation with Mr. John Howard Lawson—

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you identify Mr. Lawson?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. He is a writer, is he not?

Mr. MOFFITT. John Howard Lawson is a writer. He was the first president of the Screen Writers Guild.

It has been testified before the Tenney committee of the California Legislature that Mr. Lawson was sent to Los Angeles by the Communist Party for the purpose of organizing Communist activities in Hollywood. It was testified by a former secretary of the Communist Party for Los Angeles County.

Mr. Lawson has this record, as far as I know, with front organizations. He was a sponsor of the American Youth for Democracy, which was formerly the Young Communist League. He was a speaker at the California Labor School. He was sponsor of the City Committee for the Defense of American Youth in what was known as the Sleepy Lagoon case.

I would like to point out that the Sleepy Lagoon case was an attempt to raise a racial issue in Los Angeles.

As I understand it, the actual case had no racial implications whatever. It was a murder case in which the victim was a Mexican, the accused was Mexican, and the arresting officer was a Mexican. I use the term "Mexican" as meaning persons of Mexican descent. I do not mean to imply any discrimination against persons of Spanish or Mexican origin when I say that.

The victim in the case was an elderly, reputable hard-working good citizen. He, with some of his friends who were also of the same racial heritage, celebrated his birthday at a little farm. They had a little wine, some food, and a concrete slab on which they danced.

During the entertainment a group of what we later came to call "zoot suiters," according to the testimony of the arresting officers, loaded with marihuana, drove up, broke up the party, beat the old man to death with a tire chain and chased another of his friends into a pool or a rock quarry where, I believe, the man was drowned. I am not sure whether they saved him.

My impression is that there were two deaths.

The arresting officers were men from the Los Angeles Mexican detail and from the sheriff's office. There was absolutely no racial discrimination issue involved there until the Communist Party took it over and endeavor to reframe it, recast it, and publicize it as the

effort of the American courts to railroad innocent youths because they were of Mexican origin.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson was affiliated with that front effort of the Communist Party?

Mr. MOFFITT. He was sponsor of the city committee for the defense of these men.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you continue with his identification?

Mr. MOFFITT. He was also an endorser and has been an endorser of Communist candidates for public office on a number of occasions. He was a member of the organization for Harry Bridges' defense. He was an officer of the Hollywood Democratic Committee.

I wish to point out that according to the report of the Daily Press, that was not a Democratic committee in the sense of its being an official and reputable part of what we know as a Democratic political organization. It was a strong left-wing organization.

He was an officer of the Hollywood Independent Citizens' Committee on Arts, Sciences, and the Professions.

He was an officer of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, which the Tenney committee has pronounced as communistic. The committee was a refuge, I understand, only in case they were Communist refugees; non-Communist refugees from the Nazi terror found it very difficult to get assistance from that organization.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, if I may interrupt you at this point: Mr. Lawson has been subpoenaed to appear before the committee and will appear next week. The committee has voluminous records of his activities so that I think you have given us sufficient identification.

Mr. MOFFITT. I have more if you want it.

Mr. STRIPLING. We will go back to your activities in the Anti-Nazi League.

Mr. MOFFITT. During the period I referred to, the period between the time I discovered that this was a Communist front organization and the period some 6 weeks later, there, when I resigned, I had several conversations with Mr. Biberman, Mr. Lawson, and others of that organization.

During the course of it Mr. Lawson made this significant statement: He said:

As a writer do not try to write an entire Communist picture.

He said:

The producers will quickly identify it and it will be killed by the front office.

He said:

As a writer try to get 5 minutes of the Communist doctrine, 5 minutes of the party line in every script that you write.

He said:

Get that into an expensive scene, a scene involving expensive stars, large sets or many extras, because—

he said:

then even if it is discovered by the front office the business manager of the unit, the very watchdog of the treasury, the very servant of capitalism, in order to keep the budget from going too high, will resist the elimination of that scene. If you can make the message come from the mouth of Gary Cooper or some other important star who is unaware of what he is saying, by the time it is discovered

he is in New York and a great deal of expense will be involved to bring him back and reshoot the scene.

If you get the message into a scene employing many extras it will be very expensive to reshoot that scene because of the number of extras involved or the amount of labor that would be necessary to light and reconstruct a large set.

That was the nucleus of what he said at that time.

I later heard another statement by Mr. Lawson. That was made in the summer of 1941 when some young friends of mine who were attending what was purported to be a school for actors in Hollywood—I think it was on Labrea Boulevard—asked me to go over and hear one of the lectures, instructions on acting.

I went over on this night and Mr. Lawson was the lecturer. During the course of the evening Mr. Lawson said this—and I think I quote it practically verbatim—Mr. Lawson said to these young men and women who were training for a career of acting, he said:

It is your duty to further the class struggle by your performance.

He said—

If you are nothing more than an extra wearing white flannels on a country club veranda do your best to appear decadent, do your best to appear to be a snob; do your best to create class antagonism.

He said—

If you are an extra on a tenement street do your best to look downtrodden, do your best to look a victim of existing society.

That rather amazed me, this inner circle of instruction on acting. I could picture the chaos of a young lady who perhaps was assigned by Mr. Mayer to be the leading woman in *Lassie Come Home*, who would go out and perform as the leading woman in *Waiting for Lefty*. But that was what Mr. Lawson advised.

MR. STRIPLING. Are there any other activities or statements by persons who are identified with the Anti-Nazi League which have any relation to the Communists' activity?

MR. MOFFITT. I believe that is the most specific of anything I have. If there is any specific thing you would care to ask me further in regard to that?

MR. STRIPLING. Were you ever assigned to work with Dalton Trumbo? Dalton Trumbo was identified yesterday as a writer and as a Communist by Mr. Sam Wood, director and producer. Have you ever worked with him?

MR. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; I worked with Mr. Trumbo at Paramount in 1944. I had been away from Hollywood for 2 years. I was very much in need of money. I have a wife and two children. A job was very precious to me. I sold a producer at Paramount an idea for a story that I had and he hired me and to my joy assigned me to work with Dalton Trumbo. Mr. Trumbo is a very skilled screen writer. At that time he had just finished the script of *Kitty Foyle*, a great success, and I regarded it as a high professional privilege to work with the man. But I soon discovered that his love of mankind did not extend to me. Though he knew my predicament he never came to the studio. The producer had gone on a vacation. Mr. Trumbo, he told me, was drawing \$2,000 a week of Paramount's money at that time. Over a period of 10 weeks he came in for, I believe, four half-hour chats. He was very apologetic and said:

I am rather dogging this but I am extremely busy at this time because I am endeavoring to block lend-lease.

He said:

President Roosevelt is warmongering in assisting Britain and France in a capitalistic war.

He also told me that he was writing a great many letters to the Hearst press under the name of an uncle, I believe, whose son was a member of the crew of a submarine that had sailed to pass its tests. He told me he was pamphleteering very, very hard in this cause and used the death of this sailor as an example of the perils to the American public and the American Navy of the Roosevelt warmongering policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment. Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. May I ask you when that was?

Mr. MOFFITT. That was during the time of the Berlin-Moscow pact, when the Communist Party line was to block the war effort, denouncing Great Britain.

It was asked of Mr. Menjou if there was any touchstone by which you can identify a Communist. I think there is a touchstone by which you can identify a Communist. I think if you look at their attitude during the period of the Berlin-Moscow pact and you find that they approved of everything Nazi Germany did at that time and then reversed themselves on the very day that the Germans invaded Russia you will find that that person is a Communist and that he is following the Communist Party line.

Mr. Trumbo during that period wrote a book called *The Remarkable Andrew*. That book was bought by Paramount and was being prepared for production by another producing unit at the studio. I heard, though I do not know, that much of the time he was supposed to be working with me he was over in that unit assisting them, though that was not the story he was assigned to. *The Remarkable Andrew* said that we should not help the powers resisting fascism for the curious reason that the ghost of Andrew Jackson would not approve of it. The fact that Andrew Jackson had fought at the Battle of New Orleans to Mr. Trumbo was a conclusive reason at that time that we should not assist Russia in resisting potential Nazi invasion.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you continue to work with Mr. Trumbo; did you complete the script you were working on?

Mr. MOFFITT. The producer returned. I did not mention that Mr. Trumbo hadn't been present because I felt that a point of professional ethics was involved at that time not to snitch on my collaborator. So the producer left town again and the same conditions continued for, I believe, about 6 weeks.

Do you wish to know anything of Mr. Trumbo's public record?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Trumbo is another individual who has been subpoenaed and on which we have a quite voluminous record on which he will be questioned next week.

Mr. MOFFITT. I have a quotation from an article written by Mr. Trumbo that I believe should be introduced as evidence. With the chairman's permission I would like to read it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out Mr. Moffitt testified before the subcommittee in Los Angeles in May at some length. He is referring to testimony which he gave. I assume that is permissible?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that is agreeable.

Mr. MOFFITT. I am referring to this because I later wish to offer evidence to the effect that I think this committee is not taking steps to establish censorship. I think this committee is taking steps to end the most dangerous censorship that has ever occurred in the history of the motion-picture industry and in the history of American thought. I will expand that if I am permitted to read this as an introduction.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, is that agreeable with the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; perfectly agreeable.

Mr. MOFFITT. On May 5, 1946, Mr. Trumbo, writing on the topic *Getting Hollywood Into Focus*, in the *Worker*, said:

We have produced a few fine films in Hollywood, a great many of which were vulgar and opportunistic and a few downright vicious. If you tell me Hollywood, in contrast with the novel and the theater, has produced nothing so provocative or so progressive as *Freedom Road* or *Deep Are the Roots*, I will grant you the point, but I may also add that neither has Hollywood produced anything so untrue or so reactionary as *The Yogi and the Commissar*, *Out of the Night*, *Report on the Russians*, *There Shall Be No Night*, or *Adventures of a Young Man*. Nor does Hollywood's forthcoming schedule include such tempting items as James T. Farrell's *Bernard Clare*, Victor A. Kravchenko's *I Chose Freedom*, or the so-called biography of Stalin by Lenin Trotsky.

Mr. Trumbo was pointing out and approving the fact that the Communists had established an almost complete embargo in the world of thought, certainly in the world of fiction, against any criticism of communism or Communist Russia. That censorship involves the infiltration of Communists into the literary agencies.

I presume you gentlemen understand that most literary property and most artistic assignments are handled through professional agents who get 10 percent of what you make or the sale price. These agencies are very, very heavily infiltrated, though not dominated, I don't believe, by Communists. The publishing houses in their reading departments are very, very heavily infiltrated with Communists. Broadway is practically dominated by Communists. Hollywood has a heavy infiltration of Communists, and it is the only field of American fiction where, I think, they have been strongly resisted. I think the producers have a fine and creditable record of keeping Communist propaganda out of films. I don't think it is 100 percent. I think they slip sometimes. But I think the effort stacks up very fine in comparison with the record of Broadway.

Forty-four out of one hundred of the best plays produced on Broadway from 1936 through the season of 1946 have contained material to further the Communist Party line. Nothing like that has occurred in Hollywood; 233 other plays produced during the same period favored the party line.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, this is all your opinion as a critic; is that right?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; indeed it is. It is compiled here. It would take too long to read the details but I would be glad to submit it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you read all these scripts?

Mr. MOFFITT. I have read the condensed version of the scripts in the Burns Mantell Collection of *Ten Best Plays*, a standard work. I have read many of the actual scripts, too. I can't pretend to have read every one of these.

The CHAIRMAN. More order, please.

Mr. MOFFITT. During the same period I know of only two plays produced on Broadway that in any way challenged the Communist Party

line, one *The Unconquered*, an adaptation of a novel by Miss Ayn Rand, which you heard yesterday, that lasted a week, and the other was *There Shall Be No Night*, by Robert Sherwood. The survey of the number of novels that contained Communist line during that period is not complete but the proportions are the same or worse than those of Broadway.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, do you have a statement there by William Z. Foster which appeared in *New Masses* of April 23, 1946, relative to infiltration of Communists in the motion-picture industry?

MR. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; I do.

MR. STRIPLING. Would you read that to the committee?

MR. MOFFITT. I would like to point out that the Communists have practically rendered the English language meaningless in that they very often use a term to indicate its opposite, such as the term "democracy" which Mr. Foster uses. So before I read Mr. Foster's statement I would like to read one by Joseph Stalin which rather orients what a Communist means by "democracy." The statement that I am about to read is taken from *The Foundations of Leninism*, a series of lectures delivered in Moscow by Joseph Stalin.

In this he says:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on the use of force against the bourgeoisie.

He goes on to say:

Briefly, the dictatorship of the proletariat is a rule unrestricted by law and based on forces of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a ruling enjoying the sympathy and support of the laboring and exploited masses.

Then he proceeds to say:

My first conclusion is that the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be complete democracy, democracy for all, for the rich as well as the poor. The dictatorship of the proletariat must be a state that is democracy in a new way for the proletariat and propertyless in general and a dictatorship in a new way against the bourgeoisie.

He goes on, on page 58, to say:

In other words, the law of violent revolution, the law of smashing the bourgeois machine as a preliminary condition for such a revolution, is an inevitable law of the revolutionary movement in the imperialistic countries of the world.

With that definition of democracy in mind, I will now read what Mr. William Z. Foster had to say in the *New Masses* on April 23, 1946, speaking on elements of the peoples' cultural policy. He says:

Progressive artists should also strive to make their constructive influences felt within the scope of the great cultural organizations of the bourgeoisie. Motion pictures, radio, literature, theater, and so forth. Artists must eat like other people. Many artists, therefore, are necessarily constrained to work under direct capitalist controls on employers' pay rolls pretty much as workers. It is also politically and artistically necessary to penetrate the commercial organizations as it would be for the worker. But this does not mean that artists so employed should become servile tools or prostitutes of these exploiters as, unfortunately, many do. On the contrary, progressive artists have a double responsibility. Not only should they actively cultivate every form of independent artistic activity, but they should also fight as workers do in capitalist industry to make their democratic influences felt in the commercialized cultural organizations. The fact that capitalists through their commercialized art forms have to appeal for profits to the broadest ranks of the people makes these forms especially vulnerable to ideological and organizational pressure as much experience demonstrates.

Mr. Foster says not only that they should infiltrate their ideas, but that they have successfully infiltrated their ideas.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, based upon your observations and information, have the Communists infiltrated into Hollywood?

Mr. MOFFITT. Have they infiltrated into Hollywood?

Mr. STRIPLING. When I refer to Hollywood, I am speaking of the motion-picture industry.

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; I should say they have. I would like to bring to your attention the fact that every studio employs what are known as story analysts. These people read all stories submitted to the studio, all free-lance writing, all such scripts. This work is done by what is known as the Screen Analysts Guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, before you do that, for the benefit of the committee, would you give, briefly, the mechanics of a story from the time it is written until it is produced as a picture?

Mr. MOFFITT. There are several routines that may be followed. A studio may ask a writer already employed by them to write an original story for a specific need—if a star needs a vehicle, for example.

Mr. STRIPLING. Take, for example, a book, a best-selling novel. We will assume that a studio has bought the novel to make a picture. Will you tell the committee the various departments that that book would go through before it is produced as a film?

Mr. MOFFITT. In a large studio that literary property would be assigned to an associate producer. That associate producer would call upon, after reading it and conferring with the head of the studio as to the general approaches of the dramatization, he would then call the scenario editor, the man in charge of hiring writers.

That editor would submit to him a list of names of available writers that he thought suitable for this assignment. The list would include both writers under contract and writers off contract.

A great discretion is in that man's hands. As Mr. Sam Wood pointed out yesterday, it is very easy for him to load the list with Communists, if he is a Communist. In the case of a man under contract who never gets on one of those lists he soon has been employed for a number of months, he has received the studio's money, and because of the manipulations of a scenario editor in keeping his name off the lists of available writers, he has a record of nonemployment. Then the scenario editor, if so disposed, can go to the head of the studio and say, "None of our associate producers want to work with this man; therefore I think it advisable not to renew his contract."

Mr. Wood, I think, explained that yesterday.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes; he brought that out.

Now, the next step.

Mr. MOFFITT. Well, after the writer or writers are assigned, they very often write a "treatment," which is an outline, a break-down of the form the dramatization should take. They bring that back to the associate producer, and if he approves it he either keeps them working to develop a script or he hires other writers to develop a script. There are very often four or five scripts on one story as the script is refined and polished.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is the next step after the script? Then it is turned over to the producer or to the director?

Mr. MOFFITT. After the script is written in some studios it goes to a story board who criticizes it from various angles, from its contents,

from the ability of the studio to cast the script as written, for the way it squares with public opinion as the studio interprets it at that time; and the story board can ask for further revisions or can approve it, in which case a production date is set and it would go into production. At this stage of the game a director is usually assigned to it and since the director is responsible for getting the values of the story into film he is allowed considerable advisory power. That will fluctuate with the reputation and skill of the director and the importance of the producer. As a rule the director is listened to. It is profitable to listen to the director and to make any reasonable changes that he desires. It is best to have him happy, in other words.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to announce that this afternoon we will have Mr. Moffitt continuing his testimony and one or two other witnesses, and that tomorrow we will have the following witnesses, all writers: Mr. Rupert Hughes, Mr. Morrie Ryskind, Albert Carlson, Howard Rushmore, Richard Macaulay, Fred Niblo, Jr., and Ayn Rand.

We will recess now until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

The Chair would like to announce that if transportation arrangements can be completed today, or have been completed this morning, one of the witnesses tomorrow morning will be Mr. Robert Taylor, the actor.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you point out that the first witness will be Mr. Jim McGuinness?

The CHAIRMAN. And the first witness tomorrow morning will be Mr. Jim McGuinness. The second witness will probably be Mr. Robert Taylor.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to insert into the record certain excerpts from the testimony of Adolph Menjou which was taken in executive session in Hollywood in May. Those excerpts will only serve to elaborate on certain points he made here this morning, which would clarify the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

(The excerpts referred to above are included in Executive Hearings and will not be printed in this volume.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN CHARLES MOFFITT—Resumed

Mr. STRIPLING. Before we adjourned for the noon hour, you mentioned Story Analyst Guild. Would you tell the committee just how this Story Analyst Guild functions?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; I would be delighted to, but before I do that I would like to make a correction on my morning's testimony. Due to a too hasty glance at my chronology here, I think I confused some members of the press concerning dates. The time of my alleged col-

laboration with Mr. Trumbo at Paramount was in the spring of 1941, prior to the German invasion of Russia, the period of the Berlin-Moscow pact. I believe I failed to make the date clear. The time of my membership in the Anti-Nazi League and my conversations with John Howard Lawson is, to the best of my recollection, in 1937.

Now, as to the Story Analyst Guild, that is a union of workers whose function it is to read all material submitted to various motion-picture studios and to write synopses of the stories submitted. These synopses are placed on file and they are available to producers and associate producers in making decisions of what material they wish to screen.

As I understand it, under the terms of the contract—in the first place, I understand that the Story Analyst Guild has been named the bargaining agency for that phase of the motion-picture business. I also understand that under the contract which has been approved for that guild and the producers, the producers are not permitted to fire on the basis of political activity. It has been the experience of many writers who are not Communists that the members of this guild prepare very bad synopses on all material submitted by people who are not Communists and they damn thoroughly in their reports any stories that are not friendly to the Communist line. The president of the Story Analyst Guild and a member of the Communist Party, as I understand it, is Frances Mellington. She is head of the story analyst or reading department at Paramount. She is assisted by a woman who has repeatedly voiced very strong Communist sympathy. Her name is Simon Maise—M-a-i-s-e.

Mr. STRIPLING. How do you spell her first name, Mr. Moffitt?

Mr. MOFFITT. The French name—S-i-m-o-n.

Also in her department is Bernie Gordon, a man whose actions and talk follows the party line.

In one unit at Warner Bros. he is Dave Robison—R-o-b-i-s-o-n. I think he is in what is known as the Spurling unit at Warner Bros., I believe. His wife, Naomi Robison, was at one time, I understand, Communist treasurer for Hollywood.

Another reader at Warners, who I understand is a Communist member, is Thomas Chapman—C-h-a-p-m-a-n—but I believe he has been let out since Mr. Warner began to rid his studio of Communists.

The story man at Enterprise Studio is, I believe, a Communist, and his name is Michael Uris—U-r-i-s.

I understand that among the analysts at Metrol-Goldwyn-Mayer who are Communists and follow the party line, are Jesse Burns and Lona Packer—P-a-c-k-e-r. According to my information, Miss Packer was discharged some months ago and has not returned to that studio.

Does that answer your question?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Now, Mr. Moffitt, as a writer in Hollywood and as a critic, could you name for the committee any writers that you consider to be Communists who are employed in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. KATZ. Mr. Thomas, I represent a number of persons who have been subpoenaed—

The CHAIRMAN. I am very sorry. You are out of order. We have a witness on the stand, so please go back and sit down.

Mr. KATZ. You have said—

The CHAIRMAN. I said you are out of order.

Mr. KATZ. You have said you want a fair hearing. Cross-examination is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you take this man out of the room, please? Put him out of the room.

Go ahead with the testimony.

We must have order in these chambers, or we will be inclined to clear the room of the audience.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Moffitt, the question was: You name the writers in Hollywood according to your information who are members of the Communist Party.

Mr. MOFFITT. I am not a Government agency and I do not have the investigative powers that one would have. I have had contact with men who are former members of the FBI on the Hollywood beat and I know what they have told me. I also have followed the careers of a great number of these people and I know that those that I mention have followed the party line. I cannot tell you under oath that I have the party cards or number of these people. The men I am about to name were asked by the Hollywood Reporter: "Are you a Communist and is your party number as follows?"

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Moffitt. Would you identify the Hollywood Reporter?

Mr. MOFFITT. The Hollywood Reporter is a trade paper, a daily published in Hollywood. I think it shares with Daily Variety the distinction of being one of the two most important trade papers dealing with motion-picture matters.

Mr. STRIPLING. Go right ahead.

Mr. MOFFITT. The Hollywood Reporter, according to my information, asked Mr. Albert Maltz—M-a-l-t-z—a very able screen writer, if he was a member of the Communist Party and if his number was No. 48062. To the best of my knowledge Mr. Maltz never returned an answer. Mr. Maltz is rather significant because Mr. Maltz is significant of the discipline which the Communist Party imposes upon those of its artists which it infiltrates into the studios.

Some months ago Mr. Maltz wrote an article that attracted wide attention, which was published in the Communist press. In that—

Mr. STRIPLING. Pardon me. You refer to the Communist press. Do you mean the New Masses?

Mr. MOFFITT. I think this one was published in the Daily Worker.

Mr. STRIPLING. Official organ of the Communist Party?

Mr. MOFFITT. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right.

Mr. MOFFITT. In that article Mr. Maltz made a plea for a certain degree of intellectual freedom among radical writers. Mr. Maltz said that while Farrell, the author of Studs Lonigan, was not a Communist Party member and had resisted Communist discipline, that at the same time he thought he was a very able writer and that on the whole he was an able exponent of the leftist or extreme liberal or, as I would say, close to Communist thinking.

He named, I believe, John Dos Passos—D-o-s P-a-s-o-s—in the same article. He cited these men as examples of what he thought were laudable liberal writers who should not be condemned through their failure to be members of the Communist Party.

After the publication of that article all hell broke loose. The Communist papers were filled with articles against Maltz. He was de-

nounced as a deviator from the party line. He was called a corruptor of party discipline. The best writers, the best literary hatchetmen in the party, were called upon to work him over. They worked him over so thoroughly that he wrote an article, subsequently wrote an article, for the Daily Worker, in which he completely denied. He beat his breast. He said he was wrong to have voiced the idea that an artist should have any independence of thought. He begged——

MR. STRIPLING. Pardon me. Would you say that would be a classic example of the discipline which the party exacts from its members?

MR. MOFFITT. I most certainly would. It is the type of discipline that we are all too familiar with in Russia. But here it occurred on American soil, to a man, a very sensitive man, and a very able writer and one who, as far as I know, follows the party line as closely as he can. But he did have a liberal deviation in his thinking. He was condemned for it. When he published his retraction, he not only retracted his former principles, but he attacked those who had lauded him for his stand. That is a classic example to my mind of the discipline that the Communist Party applies to its artists.

The next name that has been brought up is that of Robert Rossen—R-o-s-s-e-n. I am not sure that a number was asked on him.

The next was Dalton Trumbo, to whom I referred this morning. He was asked if he was a Communist and if his party number was No. 36805. As far as I know, he made no reply.

The next name was that of Gordon Kahn—K-a-h-n. He was asked if he was a party member and if his number was No. 48294. So far as I know, in spite of the fact that many months have elapsed, he has never made a reply to that inquiry.

The next name is that of Ring Lardner, Jr. He was asked if he was a Communist and if his party number was No. 25109. The same was true in his case.

The next was Richard J. Collins—C-o-l-l-i-n-s. He was asked if he was a Communist and if his number was No. 11148, with the same results.

The next was Harold Buchman—B-u-c-h-m-a-n. He was asked if he was a Communist and if his number was No. 46802. As far as I know, he never denied it.

The next was Lester Cole—C-o-l-e. He was asked if he was a Communist and if his number was No. 46805. So far as I know, he never denied that.

The next was Henry Meyers. He was asked if he was a Communist and if his number was No. 25065. As far as I know, he never denied that.

The next was William Pomerance. I don't believe a number was asked of him.

The next was Morris Harry Rapf—R-a-p-f. I believe that should be "Junior." He was asked if he was a Communist and if his number was No. 25113. As far as I know, he never denied that.

The next was Harold J. Salemsen—S-a-l-e-m-s-e-n. No number was asked of him.

Nor was it of John Wexley—W-e-x-l-e-y.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, are all of these writers whom you have named rather prominent writers?

MR. MOFFITT. I think so, with the exception of Salemsen. I think Salemsen was more in the position of an organizer, and he held a

salaried position with the Screen Writers Guild. He also had been editor of an Army newspaper, at one of the cantonments during the war.

Mr. STRIPLING. The writers that are in the category of these men, approximately what would their salaries be? Would it be in excess of \$500 a week?

Mr. MOFFITT. I would think so, in each case, though I have no knowledge of their salary. I think the Treasury Department should supply that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, would you give the committee the various techniques which writers employ to inject Communist scenes or lines into motion pictures?

Mr. MOFFITT. Well, the technique usually followed is that laid down by Mr. Lawson. It is the "drop of water" technique the 5 minutes of party-line technique, the gradual conditioning of American thought along the leftist line. During the war the party line was to identify the class war with the war against Nazi Germany. The technique in that case was to show every quisling to be a man with property or a man of the managerial class. There were a number of instances in which that was done.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you give the committee those instances?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir, I could, but I beg you not to ask me to. I think that the most infamous aspect of Lawson's technique is that of involving innocent people. I think that many a time an actor plays that 5 minutes without knowing the significance of what he is doing. I think on many occasions—I think on practically every occasion that I know of the producer, both the associate producer and the studio heads, was in complete ignorance of what was done. I think very often the director may not know.

Now, this is done occasionally in pictures involving budgets of one and a half or two million dollars. That gets into the picture, and if I name that picture I will be working a hardship on innocent people. I would very much prefer, with your permission, to name those pictures in executive session.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have, however, as a critic for Esquire magazine, reviewed pictures in which you pointed out various scenes and lines which to your mind were a reflection of the party line?

Mr. MOFFITT. No, sir; I have not done that in Esquire magazine. I have named some pictures which I thought contained material that was derogatory to the ministry, to the priesthood, giving an unfair picture of American business and of the free-enterprise system, but I have not specifically named them in Esquire as Communist.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think it would be possible to pin the direct responsibility for these techniques down to certain individuals, by thorough investigation?

Mr. MOFFITT. By thorough investigation by you or by the FBI, I believe it could be done, but as an individual, acting with a reporter's experience and knowing the numerous people that are involved in the making of a picture, I do not feel free to assume the responsibility of pointing the finger at these various pictures and saying who was responsible for a given 5 minutes.

Mr. STRIPLING. But is there any question in your mind, as a critic and reviewer, that the 5 minutes was in the picture?

Mr. MOFFITT. The 5 minutes has been in a number of pictures. As I told you this morning, I think that the motion-picture industry has done a remarkably fine job on keeping it out. I think that their record is much better than that of the publishing houses or that of Broadway. I don't agree with Mr. Mayer that it has been 100-percent successful, but I think it has been in the neighborhood of 98-percent successful. I think that, if I name these pictures here, it will smear them to the public and it will work a hardship on many, many people of sound American principles. I am very willing to name them in executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. That is perfectly agreeable. I think you are absolutely correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, then, without naming any specific picture, could you give us some example of the techniques that have been employed?

Mr. MOFFITT. Well, I gave you one, of the confusion of the class war with the war against Nazi Germany. There is also the campaign against religion, where the minister will be shown as the tool of his richest parishioner, where it will be inferred that the policies of an entire diocese, let us say, of the Episcopal Church, are dictated by a rich, reactionary woman, where it will be inferred that an honest clergyman is interfered with in his duties to the poorer members of his diocese by rich and reactionary women.

There has also been the party line of making the returned soldier fear that the world is against him, that the American principle is against him, that business is against him, that the free-enterprise system is against him. You will see picture after picture in which the banker is presented as an unsympathetic man, who hates to give a GI a loan. In connection with that I have a note here, based on my own inquiry, that I would like to read.

A number of pictures have shown the banker as the villain, pictures dealing with returned veterans. I saw this on the screen so frequently that I decided that, if I was to act in any sense as a conscientious reviewer, I should make some inquiries about the true conditions. I contacted the Bank of America in Los Angeles and also contacted the editors of Veterans magazine. I made this inquiry last May. At the time of my investigation I found that the Bank of America in California alone has made 36,000 real-estate loans to veterans, for a total amount of \$280,000,000. These figures do not include business loans. Of those loans, according to the Bank of America, there were only two at that time threatened with foreclosure. At that time veterans' loans were being processed at the rate of 80 to 90 a day by this one bank. I think that is an aspect of the banking industry's attitude toward returning veterans that refutes a great deal that has been infiltrated into scripts about their hard-hearted attitude toward veterans.

Mr. STRIPLING. The term "heavy" has been used here as a designation of the part in which the person is a villain. Would you say that the banker has been often cast as a heavy, or consistently cast as a heavy, in pictures in Hollywood?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir. I think that due to Communist pressure he is overfrequently cast as a heavy. By that I do not mean that I think no picture should ever show a villainous banker. In fact, I would right now like to defend one picture that I think has been unjustly accused of communism. That picture is Frank Capra's *It's a Wonder-*

ful Life. The banker in that picture, played by Lionel Barrymore, was most certainly what we call a "dog heavy" in the business. He was a snarling, unsympathetic character. But the hero and his father, played by James Stewart and Samuel S. Hines, were businessmen, in the building and loan business, and they were shown as using money as a benevolent influence.

The CHAIRMAN. I must insist that we have order. People in the audience are the guests of this committee. Those people include the witnesses who are going to be called before the committee. We just must have order all the time. Go ahead.

Mr. CRUMM. All we ask, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. I said we want order.

Mr. CRUMM. All we ask is the same right accorded to Howard Hughes.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Come away. Everybody sit down. Will all you people who are standing up please sit down? And the photographers.

Mr. MOFFITT. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. MOFFITT. Well, to summarize, I think that Mr. Capra's picture, though it had a banker as villain, could not be properly called a Communist picture. It showed that the power of money can be used oppressively and it can be used benevolently. I think that picture was unjustly accused of communism.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have there also been cases in which the legislative branch of our Government has been put up for ridicule or for scorn through certain scenes or themes in pictures?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; there have. There has been more of that on Broadway, but there has been some of it in Hollywood.

I would like to repeat the opinion of previous witnesses that I think the studios are showing much more vigilance in suppressing these party lines and that in recent months there has been very, very little of that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know of any particular story or picture which is in production which has as its theme the belittling of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MOFFITT. I know of some in production where that could be possible, but since I have not read the scripts—their adaptations of plays—I would not like to speak on that because—

Mr. STRIPLING. There has been some mention of a play by Emmett Lavery.

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir. Emmett Lavery is the president of the Screen Writers Guild. His opinions upon the Congress I think are set forth in a play which is now the subject of a \$2,000,000 libel suit. The play is called *The Gentleman From Athens*. In the character of Cousin Vincent, the banker, Mr. Lavery follows the line of making him a very unsympathetic character, just because he is a banker. We are never told that he has done any specific thing that is villainous, but in relation to him there are such lines as, "You have to know him before you begin to despise him." The mere sight of him scares the heroine into the jitters. That attitude toward him is maintained throughout the play, though no specific act is charged against him.

Mr. Lavery follows the Communist tactic of scaring Americans to death with their own atom bomb. Ever since the armistice it seems

to me that the people of the United States have been engaged in one of the great moral experiments in the history of mankind. For the first time, a people have had in their hands an invincible weapon and their sole concern has been how not to use it. In exchange for that, the leftists have called us warmongers. They have insisted that we are imperialists, though we have taken no territory and the Russians have. And they have persistently insisted that if we didn't behave ourselves, if we didn't cease to be warmongers, if we didn't cease to be imperialists who get nothing, that we would be blown to death by our own atom bomb.

Now, Mr. Lavery promotes that same idea in this play. One line says:

I met a Russian the other day. He wanted to bet me the Russians could smash just as many atoms as we could. But I was smart. I wouldn't bet him.

There is another line. The heroine's brother remonstrating with her for having spent her last thousand dollars to go to Europe to escape from the air of Washington, which she found very oppressive, says:

Sure, but I'm a pretty smart fellow, getting smarter all the time. I didn't have to take my last thousand dollars and throw it away on one last look at the vanishing continent of Europe. No, sir. I save my money. I got all the disillusionment I wanted right here at home. I just stood up night after night in the best Washington bars with the best Senators and the best Congressmen and the best everybody, and you know what, I feel just as awful as you do and I never left home at all.

A character is introduced by the name of Big Ed, who is presented as having great influence as a fixer with Congress. He says this:

Every time there is trouble, there is someone who survives. The only trick is to make sure you're among the survivors.

The central character——

MR. STRIPLING. Pardon me. Was Mr. Lavery an unsuccessful candidate for the House of Representatives in the last election?

MR. MOFFITT. I think he was.

MR. STRIPLING. Yes, sir.

MR. MOFFITT. The hero of this play is a racketeer and a crook who files on both tickets in California to become a Member of the House of Representatives, buys votes, and wins in both primaries. Of him it is said:

He is no worse than half the Congressmen you meet and a lot better than most. He is just a bit more open about things.

In the second scene, he is presented as a hero because he socked a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee for calling him a Communist, though no evidence is offered to show that he wasn't a Communist. He says, in the course of this scene:

Democrats or Republicans, what's the difference. Sure, a few guys on each side of the aisle may be on the up and up, but a few aren't enough. The people who built this country had a wonderful idea, but some of these buzzards in the House, they don't take it serious. Hell, they run it like it was some kind of game. Yes; and not a very straight one, either. Hell, if I wanted to play that kind of play, I could have stayed home and gone down to Tia Juana or Agua Caliente. I don't have to come to Washington. Oh, what the hell. Maybe democracy isn't such a hot idea after all.

That is one of his speeches.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Moffitt, Mr. Lavery is the president of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. MOFFITT. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. There has been considerable testimony taken here regarding the Communist domination of the Screen Writers Guild. Do you share the opinion given by other witnesses that it is under the control of the Communist Party?

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; I do. It was founded by John Howard Lawson. It has an electoral system that I think makes for an organizational dictatorship. Nominations are not made from the floor. There is a nominating committee appointed by the officers—a good piece of machinery to keep themselves in power for as long as they please.

I think the record of the Screen Writers, their official publication, is one of being filled with leftist propaganda and no other propaganda. No one dares raise his voice. The meetings that I have attended have been conducted so that the Communists howl down anyone who attempts to raise a non-Communist voice and—

Mr. STRIPLING. Pardon me. Do all writers employed in the motion-picture industry have to belong to the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. MOFFITT. Eighty percent of them have to because of a ruling by the National Labor Relations Board recognizing them as the bargaining agent. Very few writers are permitted to remain in that outside 20 percent. The studios like to have that 20 percent always open in case some very eminent novelist or playwright from abroad is brought over here. They don't wish to make him go through that red tape. So the tendency is to ask all writers under contract and practicing and living in Hollywood to belong to the guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. In other words, if you are employed in the motion-picture industry as a writer, it is necessary almost to join an organization which is under the domination of the Communist clique within it: is that correct?

Mr. MOFFITT. I believe it is. I think on two occasions it was attempted to run a ticket of candidates for officers in the guild on the very platform that they were opposed to, both fascism and communism, but that never came off.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know who is the editor of the Screen Writers magazine?

Mr. MOFFITT. Gordon Kahn at the moment, I believe.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was Dalton Trumbo at one time the editor—in 1946, in fact, was he the editor?

Mr. MOFFITT. I think Dalton Trumbo served two terms as editor. I think he was the editor when the magazine was first incepted.

Mr. STRIPLING. Does the magazine reflect the party line in its editorial policy?

Mr. MOFFITT. It reflects an extremely leftist line. I believe that there is to be another witness who is better qualified to go into that. I have not made a painstaking survey of it.

I might also add that Mr. Lavery—I don't want to bore you with these lengthy quotations, unless you wish to hear them, but he also strongly advocates that the United States abandon its sovereignty to become part of a world state. In the course of the play he admits that the Russians don't want to do that, either, but his excuse is that the

Russians have had their sovereignty just a little while and we shouldn't be impatient if they wish to enjoy it for some time—but that we have had it long enough that we should be willing to give it up.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Moffitt, do you have any evidence to the effect that the Communist members of the Screen Writers Guild actively participate in Communist Party activities in Los Angeles, or whether they have engaged in any espionage work for the Communist Party?

Mr. MOFFITT. Of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. STRIPLING. That is right.

Mr. MOFFITT. No, sir; I don't have any evidence—well, that is a double question. There has been ample evidence in the press, in the Hollywood Citizen-News, that numbers of them have been engaged in Communist activities. I don't have those records with me. I can get them from Los Angeles.

The second part of your question was: Have they engaged in espionage? I know of no members of the Screen Writers Guild who have engaged in espionage.

Mr. STRIPLING. The reference was made here yesterday by Mr. Wood to the effect that he considered these people to be the agents of a foreign government. I wondered if you are familiar with any activities on the part of anyone in Hollywood who is a Communist that you consider to be engaged in activity which would be detrimental to the best interests of the United States.

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes, sir; I know of the activity of Mr. John Weber, who is head of the literary department of the William Morris Agency. Mr. Weber—

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you explain what the William Morris Agency is, please?

Mr. MOFFITT. The William Morris Agency is one of the many talent agencies that are in the business of selling literary material, writers or actors—any artists useful to the screen—and of obtaining contracts for them. For that service, as is legal, they get 10 percent of that artist's income. Agencies operate under a State law which fixes their legal commission at 10 percent.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were speaking of Mr. Weber.

Mr. MOFFITT. Yes. Mr. Weber is head of the literary department of the William Morris Agency. He is assisted by Mr. Dave Ware—W-a-r-e.

You may remember that early this year Life magazine and other publications ran the picture of a young Army test pilot by the name of Slick Goodlin—G-o-o-d-l-i-n. Goodlin was assigned to test the supersonic plane which this Government had invested a number of millions of dollars in. Early in the spring Goodlin came to Hollywood on a visit. Mr. Weber and a number of people of strong left-wing tendencies got to the boy. They told him that one engaged in his activity should most certainly have a wonderful story to sell to the magazines. I understood that he replied that anything he wrote would have to be passed through military intelligence. The reply was, "Oh, of course, that will be done, but let us see a sample of what you can write, and we will see whether it is admissible," whether it is practical to be prepared for magazine publication.

The boy was foolish enough to do this and his story, his draft of a magazine article containing, as I understand it, much confidential information on the supersonic plane came into the hands of Mr. Weber,

the literary agent who was sent to Hollywood by Communist headquarters in New York. I understand that that has been taken up by the FBI.

At any rate, Goodlin was assigned to the supersonic plane.

Weber was also present at a meeting in Hollywood reported by the Hollywood Citizen-News as follows:

"Contemporary Writers" described by an advertisement in the Communist newspaper Peoples Daily World, has "a countrywide organization of Marxist and anti-Fascist writers," proceeded with the development of a Hollywood chapter.

In response to the notice in the Communist newspaper, about 80 Hollywood writers met over the Greyhound bus depot on Chuenga Boulevard last night to launch the program.

They heard Charles Glenn, acting chairman of the chapter, explain that it is now possible to get anti-Fascist views published in popular magazines if writers and agents go about it in the right way.

Glenn indicated that Contemporary Writers is not satisfied with getting material published in magazines like the New Republic, the New Masses, and Main Stream. It proposes to get its anti-Fascist material into magazines like Collier's.

This, he promised, is not as difficult as the writers might suppose. Within the past few months, he said, Collier's has published six stories which conform to the views of the new organization.

The writers were cautioned later by John Weber, a writers' agent with the William Morris Agency, not to draw unwarranted conclusions from the acceptance of these stories by Collier's.

"Publishers," he said, "will take anything which they believe will be profitable to them."

The same, he said, is true of the motion-picture industry. As an example of the inclinations of publishers and producers, Weber said that Daryl Zanuck who produced the Grapes of Wrath was now fiddling with a thing called The Iron Curtain.

The principal talk was given by Alvah Bessie, veteran screen writer who was introduced as a hero of the Spanish Civil War in which he served with the International Brigade.

Bessie assured the writers that "There are never two sides to any question."

Is there anything further?

Mr. STRIPLING. Not on that point.²²

Mr. Chairman, I have some other matters which I would like to question Mr. Moffitt about but which I desire to dispose of in executive session. Those are all the questions I have at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. With regard to that we would like to take up some of those pictures that you mentioned before and I suggest we take those up in executive session. Without objection we will take those matters up in executive session.

Mr. STRIPLING. If you are going to have an executive session I have no further questions at this time. I would like Mr. Moffitt to stand by.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Then will you stand by and we will get in touch with you just as soon as we recess today.

Call the next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Ruppert Hughes.

²² See appendix, pp. 526-528, for exhibits 30-32.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hughes.

Mr. Hughes, do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me God?

Mr. HUGHES. I do.

TESTIMONY OF RUPPERT HUGHES

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Hughes, will you please state your full name?

Mr. HUGHES. Rupert Hughes.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present address?

Mr. HUGHES. 4751 Los Feliz Boulevard, Los Angeles.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Hughes?

Mr. HUGHES. Lancaster, Mo.

Mr. STRIPLING. In what year?

Mr. HUGHES. 1872.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. HUGHES. A writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever been a writer in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; in many ways.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are here in response to a subpoena served on you September 29?²³

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you briefly outline to the committee the various positions you have held as a writer in Hollywood?

Mr. HUGHES. Would you repeat that, please?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes, sir. Would you outline for the committee some of the various writing positions you have held in Hollywood?

Mr. HUGHES. Well, a great many of my stories were put in films. I was made, by Samuel Goldwyn, one of the so-called eminent authors; was taken to Hollywood; became a scenario writer, and was there for some years as a director.

After that I wrote treatments for pictures. I was with the Goldwyn studios and the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer studios for many years until I resigned. After that, as I say, I wrote a few treatments for pictures but never had an association with the studios.

I believe I was one of the four founders of the Authors' League and one of the few founders of the Screen Writers Guild.

That went along very well for a few years until John Howard Lawson and some of his people revived it in order to make it an instrument of Communist power. About 100 of us got tired of this, the way they were going at things and blocking everything off so we founded the Screen Playwrights.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you tell us in what year that was, Mr. Hughes?

Mr. HUGHES. I should think that would be around 1925 or 1926. I am very vague as to the dates.

We were so violently attacked by the Screen Writers Guild people as Fascists and enemies of freedom that they were finally forced to disband. We were called a company union, of course. It was my theory if I worked for a man I owed him a certain loyalty; if I didn't like him I could resign, and I did just that.

²³ See appendix, p. 529, for exhibit 33.

I stayed with the Screen Playwrights and the Authors' League, which had also turned to be Communist—it is recovering now—demanded that I resign either from the Authors' League or the Screen Playwrights. I refused to do either.

Then Dudley Nichols, a writer—I don't know if he is a Communist but he is certainly very leftist—went to New York and demanded that the Authors' League expel me.

MR. STRIPLING. On what grounds, Mr. Hughes?

MR. HUGHES. That was around 1932 or 1933.

MR. STRIPLING. On what grounds?

MR. HUGHES. On the ground that I disobeyed the orders of the council; my conduct was unbecoming a member of the Authors' League.

Communists are notable for two things, one is slavish obedience to their orders and demands of slavish obedience from others.

The American Authors' Authority, which is an attempt by the Screen Writers Guild to take all American authors under authority—I claim nobody has any authority over American writers, particularly not American writers. We have laws on the books for that, of course.

The Screen Writers Guild tried to get me forced out of the Authors' League. As I say, they did not succeed. Then I was subjected to a great deal of violent attack and slander. I tried to answer it in kind.

I don't know who is a Communist because I have never seen a Communist card and most of them are either discreet or cowardly enough to refuse to admit they are Communists.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Hughes, at that point, however, by observing their activities and the line which they followed weren't you able to discern which ones were closely associated with the Communists, even though you do not have their Communist Party cards?

MR. HUGHES. Yes. You can't help smelling them, in a way. Their ideas are all one way. I have had furious debates with Emmett Lavery in forums and privately in the Authors' Guild, where they tried to force their authority on the Authors' Guild, the Dramatists' Guild.

Lavery is a good Catholic, he says, but I say a man whose views are Communist, whose friends are Communists, and whose work is communistic is a Communist. I would say if a wolf wear's sheep's clothing that man is a wolf.

I think those 19 gentlemen have labeled themselves as Communists, but I don't know that any one of them is one.

One thing that I feel tests a Communist is this: Before we entered the Second World War Hitler and Stalin were buddies committed to great ideals, destroying England and then the United States. I was asked to take part in a forum at the University of California at Los Angeles.

This might have a bearing, sir, on one writer who is quite prominent. Herbert Biberman, a very prominent writer, attacked at this University of California forum, England, lend-lease, Roosevelt, conscription, every prepared measure we attempted. I was hissed and booed on that same program where he was loudly applauded because I attacked Hitler, who was then in partnership with Stalin. I was charged by Communists in resolutions as being a bloody-minded degenerate trying to get the blood of American boys spilled on foreign soil. Biberman took part in that.

Then when Hitler attacked Stalin, Biberman and his brethren came down and joined a regiment of which I was a colonel. Charlie Chap-

lin came to New York and demanded an accounting for it. They were all fighting for Russia, not for us.

That is the way I tell a Communist, a man who never says a word against the bloodiest butcher in history, Stalin, and who says violent words against the most modest American. That is my test.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Hughes, do you consider the Screen Writers Guild to be under Communist domination at the present time?

Mr. HUGHES. Weakeningly so. It was absolutely under Communist domination when the authority was put to use. It was voted for something like 310 to 7 and the poor 7 were hissed and booed. It was revived, then the last vote was something like 225 to 125. The anti-Communists are trying to take it back and I have some hopes they will succeed. It has been, up to the present, strongly dominated by Communists.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think the Communists in Hollywood at the present time are on the defensive or on the offensive?

Mr. HUGHES. I think they are on the defensive now because they are losing a great many of those fashion followers who thought it was smart to be Communists and who now find it is unpopular and are deserting them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you familiar with the attacks which they are now leveling against anyone who is opposed to their party line, shall we say? For example, the committee and this investigation. They have issued numerous statements and documents to the effect that the committee is attempting to bring about thought control. What is your opinion as to the thought-control theme which they are now following?

Mr. HUGHES. I nearly died laughing when a large meeting was held in Hollywood by a great many leftists who oppose thought control. In Russia, which they defend, thought control or free thought is as impossible as free speech, free press, and free assembly.

I think Mr. Kenny and his group are very comical in challenging a congressional committee for investigating things when, if they opened their mouths in Russia, they would be shot before they could open them a second time.

I think it is infamous for any American to keep quiet about Russia. Russia may be fighting us any minute—in fact is fighting us now. I think any Communist is an enemy spy or agent. I don't think we ought to speak to them. We ought to treat them the way we treated Benedict Arnold. They are worse than Benedict Arnold. They are fighting every effort anyone has ever made.

They tried to force me out of the Authors' League, as well as others. I know anti-Communist writers in Hollywood who have been forced practically to starvation by the refusal of the Communist writers to work for them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Hughes, who are the people in Hollywood that you feel could do most to thwart the activities of the Communists?

Mr. HUGHES. I think their names have been mentioned here numerous times. I would subscribe to all of them. I have a poor memory. You read them to me and I can give you my opinion of them.

Mr. STRIPLING. I am afraid you misunderstood my question. I will reframe it.

Who would the responsibility rest with for cleaning the Communists out of the motion-picture industry?

Mr. HUGHES. Well, I think the producers in general should do it because they are the people who hire and fire. I think they have been unjustifiably lax. They have paid from \$2,000 to \$5,000 a week to men whom they know to be brilliant. Many Communists are very, very brilliant. They permit them to as little poison in.

They say no Communist pictures have been put forth. Of course they haven't. *Mission to Moscow* was a Communist picture. That rather discouraged Communist propaganda, but where you see a little drop of cyanide in the picture, a small grain of arsenic, something that makes every Senator, every businessman, every employer a crook and which destroys our beliefs in American free enterprise and free institutions, that is communistic. The producer should stop it.

We have many Communist directors who not only permit but encourage it. We have a flood of Communist writers. Some of them are openly Communists and some secretly.

Mr. STRIPLING. You mentioned Communist directors. Are there any directors you consider to be Communists?

Mr. HUGHES. The directors I consider to be Communists, I have no information from personal interviews and personal talks with them, but they were mentioned here by Sam Wood, who knows them all. He had a terrific fight in the Directors' Guild. The Communists tried to take that over. They tried to take over the Actors' Guild and they have tried to take over everything in America.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have no personal knowledge yourself of any Communist directors?

Mr. HUGHES. Not from personal contact.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have any personal knowledge of any Communist writers?

Mr. HUGHES. I know a great many writers whom I consider very communistic, though I haven't seen their cards. There are dozens of them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Who would you say is the key figure in the Communist set-up in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. HUGHES. You mean as distinguished between writers, directors, and producers?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes; all of them. Who is the most important, to your mind?

Mr. HUGHES. I think they are all equally important because there has to be team play. Everything stems from the writer. The director works with the writer and of course the producer works with them both, then the head of the studio works with them all. I think everybody shares the responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt there? As I understand the question, you meant who is the leader, what individual is the Communist leader out in Hollywood?

Mr. HUGHES. I couldn't say that any one man is.

The CHAIRMAN. Who has the most influence?

Mr. HUGHES. Some individual, you mean?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; put it that way.

Mr. HUGHES. I should hesitate to say any one man has more than anyone else. It is a group of them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you familiar with any anti-Communist films or scripts which have been submitted or films which have been produced in Hollywood?

Mr. HUGHES. I can tell you of two experiences. One of them happened to me.

A man came to me and wanted to do an anti-Communist film but was afraid to do one directly attacking them, for fear they would wreck the theaters, so he asked me to do a picture ridiculing Communists and said Warner Bros. would be interested in it if I could furnish a story.

I went over it at luncheon where Jack Warner was present, Al Jolson, who was then a stockholder, and others. They were very enthusiastic and paid me \$15,000 to write about a 5,000-word plot attacking American Communists.

In the meantime Hal Wallace, who was their business manager, had been on a vacation and he returned. He said, "You are insane to attempt even a comic picture about American Communists because they will put stinkpots in every theater that tries to show it."

They were scared off and never did the picture. I had my \$15,000 and I still have my story.

This is hearsay but one writer, Galvin Wells, now an American citizen who was an Englishman, went to Russia, took motion pictures and came back and wrote a book called *Caput*, because everything in Russia was broken to pieces, all the taxicabs, all the automobiles, all the machines. Everything was *caput*.

He got his picture through with some difficulty and some cleverness. He told me—this is only hearsay—that he sold the picture to Sol Lesser. Sol Lesser was making a big motion picture of it when the wife of one of the leading Communist writers—herself being a very prominent Communist—went to Sol Lesser—this so I am told by Galvin Wells—and said, "If you show that picture we will cut up the upholstery and destroy every theater where it is shown." Sol Lesser dropped it.

I saw the picture about 4 weeks ago. That atmosphere was there, and any producer who had the faintest idea of attacking the Communists was scared out, frightened by a conspiracy to wreck the theaters, put stinkpots in the theaters, parade in front, picket them, and everything else.

There has been that tyrannical domination. Hollywood writers, producers, and directors who are anti-Communist have been scared into silence.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt you there?

Mr. HUGHES. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hughes, you may have brought in a new point that we have not had given to us before, and that is the main reason why the producers do not show anti-Communist films, because of the fear they would have that the Communists would go in there and disrupt the audience in the theater and in that way they would not make any money as a result of showing these pictures. That is a new idea you have given to us.

Mr. HUGHES. I think you could find a thousand instances of it. You know what stinkpots did at restaurants where they had labor trouble and picketed them.

The writers are clever. It has been almost impossible for years to get a word said against the Communists. You couldn't get out a play or book against them. The publishers were afraid of it. Dramatic criticism, art criticism, theatrical criticism, book criticism, the Communists have had very powerful domination for 25 years. That is very important, too, in the artistic history of this country.

You have had to write like a Russian to get a good notice. You have had to have a rough slice of life. Coming out for plain American ideals was cheap hokum and that has affected the motion-picture production.

I personally know people I have pleaded with to do something against communism who have been afraid to because the exhibitors are afraid to show such a picture.

I don't think you could emphasize strongly enough the Communist propaganda that they are weak, poor little things being poorly treated. They appeal to the Bill of Rights for protection. For 15 years they have tried to be as tyrannical here as Stalin has been in Russia. They have frightened writers, producers, actors, actresses, and everyone to death. They boycott everything.

MR. STRIPLING. Are you referring specifically to the Communist clique in the writers' field?

MR. HUGHES. When seven men voted against the American Authors' Authority they were hissed and booed. The Communists would not write with them, would not work on the same picture with them.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Hughes, what steps do you think should be taken to combat the Communist influence in the motion-picture industry?

MR. HUGHES. I think somebody should have the courage and the common sense to do it. We are on the point of a war. We have everything but a shooting war with Russia now. Every Communist or every man who tolerates communism is tolerating an enemy agent. If these Communists are not directly paid by Russia they are being cheated, because they are doing the work for nothing. I think they should be silenced, deported, or treated as the spies and agents they are.

I am the utmost believer in tolerance there ever was, but it is not tolerance to permit people to do things to destroy tolerance. They claim freedom of speech but would destroy it when they got the power.

On the radio I made a criticism of American Communists. They said, "Get that so-and-so off the air and keep him off." They drove off five or six prominent radio commentators because they were anti-Communist. Their terrorizing power is just as complete as Congress will allow it to be.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you think the Communist Party should be outlawed?

MR. HUGHES. I do. I reached that decision with great hesitation. I don't see why we should allow Russian spies and agents to be busy in our country. The writers are doing all they can to defend our enemies, enemies of humanity. Why should we tolerate it? You arrest a man for putting a couple of indecent words in a book and then let him destroy the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and everything else.

MR. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

MR. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Hughes.

(Loud applause.)

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all the witnesses for today.

The CHAIRMAN. Hearing adjourned. We will meet at 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 3:15 p. m., an adjournment was taken until 10:30 a. m. of the following day, Wednesday, October 22, 1947.)

HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. The record will show that the following members are present: Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, Mr. Nixon, and Mr. Thomas. A subcommittee is sitting.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Messrs. Louis J. Russell, Robert B. Gaston, H. A. Smith, investigators; and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

Mr. STRIPLING. The first witness is Mr. James McGuinness.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McGuinness, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF JAMES K. McGUINNESS

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. McGuinness, will you state your full name and present address, please.

Mr. McGUINNESS. James K. McGuinness, 911 North Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. McGuinness?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I was born in Ireland, December 20, 1894.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I am a motion-picture executive.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are employed at what studio?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is the nature of your duties at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I exercise a general editorial supervision over a proportion of the scripts prepared for production in that studio.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Motion-Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I am. I was one of the founder members.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you presently hold any position in the organization?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I am a member of the executive committee in that organization.

Mr. STRIBLING. Mr. Chairman, the examination of Mr. McGuinness will be conducted by Mr. Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, will you tell us what the purpose of the Motion-Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals is?

Mr. McGUINNESS. The purpose was to combat what we regard as a growing menace within our own industry of Communists and to some degree Fascists, and to preserve, as we stated in our original principles, the screen in its loyalty to the free America which gave it birth.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, have there been any evidences of fascism in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. McGUINNESS. No. There have been some Fascist organizations functioning at times in the Los Angeles area, but no branches of those organizations ever appeared within the motion-picture industry.

Mr. SMITH. How long have you been connected with the motion-picture industry?

Mr. McGUINNESS. About 21 years.

Mr. SMITH. During that time in what various capacities?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I was a writer, a writer-producer, and an executive.

Mr. SMITH. What was your first experience with communistic activities in Hollywood?

Mr. McGUINNESS. My first experience was during the reorganization of the Screen Writers Guild in the period from 1933 to 1935. Under that reorganization John Howard Lawson was the first president of the Screen Writers Guild.

Sometime in 1935 a new constitution was proposed for the Authors League of America and the Screen Writers Guild as a component part of that organization. We discovered—a group of us discovered—that for 60 days there had been an intensive campaign of small meetings educating selected groups of the members of the Screen Writers Guild of this new constitution. It had been kept away from those members who might have been critical, or who might conceivably have opposed it.

On analysis of that constitution we found that it would result in centering within the board of directors of the Screen Writers Guild such a control over the economic existence of all writers that it provided for disciplinary measures to be applied to writers guilty of conduct prejudicial to the good order of the guild—without specifying what that conduct was—that a man could be destroyed economically under that authority.

So we fought ratification of that proposed constitution and bylaws.

Prominent in that fight to ratify the constitution were John Howard Lawson, Donald Ogden Stewart, Tess Schlessinger, now deceased, and her then husband, Frank Davis.

Mr. SMITH. How many members were there in the Screen Writers Guild in 1935?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I would say somewhere between 300 and 400 members.

Mr. SMITH. What proportion of the screen writers were members of the guild?

Mr. McGUINNESS. At that time I would say perhaps 60 percent.

Mr. SMITH. During the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact, what occurred at a convention of the League of American Writers held in New York?

Mr. McGUINNESS. At that time there had been a strike at the North American aircraft factory in Inglewood, Calif. President Roosevelt denounced the strike as Communist-inspired and a conspiracy. He sent troops to reopen the plant.

There was a convention of the League of American Writers held in New York simultaneously with this occurrence, which was attended by members, either officers or members, of the board of directors of the Screen Writers Guild. A telegram was dispatched to the President from the convention of the League of American Writers, and signed by four members of the executive board, or the board of directors, of the Screen Writers Guild. Two of the names I recall. They were Donald Ogden Stewart and John Howard Lawson.

In Hollywood there was immediate resentment to this telegram signed by officers and members of the board of the Screen Writers Guild, and agitation of protest ensued. Presently those four members were forced to resign their official positions in the guild.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, can you tell us any other Communist-front organizations that were formed during the Stalin-Hitler pact?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think during the Stalin-Hitler pact, during that period front organizations were not particularly popular. They were formed before and after the Hitler-Stalin pact.

Mr. SMITH. What, if anything, could you tell us about the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League?

Mr. McGUINNESS. The Hollywood Anti-Nazi League was formed with a very sympathetic title which enlisted the support of very many excellent and patriotic Americans in the motion-picture community.

Shortly after its organization Mr. Edward Chodorov, a screen writer and playwright, approached Col. Lawrence Stallings, the author of *What Price Glory*, and asked him if he and I would serve as co-chairmen of the publicity committee of that organization. Colonel Stallings had discussed this with me, and having had some experience with Communist-controlled groups due to my activity in the Screen Writers Guild, I said I would be only too happy to serve if somewhere, either in a statement of principles, or in the title of the organization, they would specify they were equally opposed to communism.

Colonel Stallings carried that message back and was told that was impossible, so neither Colonel Stallings or I served.

Mr. SMITH. The American Peace Mobilization was formed during the time you referred to, I believe. Have you any comments regarding that?

Mr. McGUINNESS. The American Peace Mobilization was first formed in Hollywood under the name, I think, of the Emergency Peace Conference. Among the founder members was Herbert Biberman, a motion-picture director.

After its formation in Hollywood it took on national scope, became the American Peace Mobilization, and during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact representatives of that organization picketed the White House, denouncing the war as imperialist, and denouncing the President as a warmonger.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, in your opinion were any pictures made during the period June 1941 through 1945 which you would consider pro-Communist pictures?

Mr. McGUINNESS. During the period of the war, when I would prefer to call them pro-Soviets more so than pro-Communist, there were three pictures made which have been discussed before this Committee: Mission to Moscow, which, in my opinion, distorted history; North Star, and Song of Russia, which represented Russia as a never-never land, flowing with milk and honey. I never regarded them too seriously since they were made during the war. In fact, I looked on them as a form of intellectual lend-lease.

I might say that we profited by reverse lend-lease because during the same period the Communist and Communist-inclined writers in the motion-picture industry were given leave of absence to become patriotic.

During that time under my general supervision Dalton Trumbo wrote two magnificently patriotic scripts, A Guy Named Joe, and Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo, which made excellent pictures, I think.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer have you ever observed any efforts on behalf of the Communist Party to suppress a picture?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Will you relate that to the committee?

Mr. McGUINNESS. In 1941, prior to our entrance into the war, there was written and produced at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer the picture called Tennessee Johnson. The picture was based on the life of Andrew Johnson. It was basically an American success story in that it showed a backwoodsman from Tennessee who was illiterate in adulthood, taught to read and write by the woman who later became his wife, eventually succeeding to the office of President of the United States.

It showed a man so devoted to the ideals of Abraham Lincoln that although he lacked the power of Lincoln he put his own career in jeopardy to carry out the ideals laid down by his predecessor.

The producer of this picture, J. Walter Reuben, died during the actual making of the picture, and I took it over as part of my executive functions.

Before the shooting of the picture was finished, much to my surprise, there was circulated in the studio a protest against the content of this picture, signed by five men who, in my opinion, had consistently followed the Communist Party line in every twist and turn. Those men were Donald Ogden Stewart; Hy Kraft, a writer; Richard Collins, a writer; Jules Dassin; and Ring Lardner, Jr.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt right there?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to say, Mr. McGuinness, this committee has made a very thorough investigation of Communist personnel in Hollywood. We have a very complete record on at least 79 persons active out in Hollywood. The time will come in these hearings when this documented evidence will be presented, so I just want to let you know now you cannot make the kind of investigation we can, but we have made a very thorough investigation, and that material will be presented at this public hearing, either some time this week or some time next week.

Mr. McDOWELL. May I just ask this question?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. McGuinness, you said a protest was circulated in the studio. In what fashion was that—to whom did it go?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Perhaps the word "circulated" is wrong. The protest was signed by these men and sent to Mr. Al Lickman, the executive vice president who had over-all control of the production of this picture.

The CHAIRMAN. The record will show Mr. Wood is present, and a quorum of the full committee is present.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, will you give those names again and spell them, please?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Hy Kraft—K-r-a-f-t; Donald Ogden Stewart.

Mr. SMITH. Is that S-t-e-w-a-r-t?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes. Ring Lardner, Jr.; Richard Collins.

Mr. SMITH. And Jules Dassin?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes. I think it is spelled D-a-s-s-i-n.

Mr. SMITH. Was there any more information or further statements made at that time as to what this group or their associates intended to do if the picture was not suppressed?

Mr. McGUINNESS. A campaign developed immediately afterward. The picture, which had not been finished and which nobody had seen except a few people intimately working on it, was attacked as misrepresenting history and as being a reflection on the Negro race.

Mr. SMITH. Was the picture ever finished?

Mr. McGUINNESS. The picture was finished. I could not at first determine the reason for this attack. There were only two people of the colored race in the picture, both represented as dignified, intelligent, and fine human beings.

I discovered later through investigation that since we had made a picture concerning the life of Andrew Johnson, Thaddeus Stephens had appeared as a manager for the House in the proceedings in the Senate against the President; that Thaddeus Stephens had been used extensively throughout the South by the Communist Party as the first patron saint of communism in the United States—as a very heroic figure. In fact, I discovered that there was on Central Avenue in Los Angeles a Communist-front club called the Thaddeus Stephens Club. So, in representing Mr. Stephens in his true light we had apparently done the Communists a disservice, and that was the reason for the attempt to suppress the picture.

Mr. SMITH. Is it your opinion their attempts were somewhat successful in suppressing that picture?

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Smith, I want to say something right here.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. McDOWELL. Just to keep the record straight, Thaddeus Stephens was a great American patriot and citizen. Pennsylvania is very proud of Thaddeus Stephens and the role he played in American history.

The CHAIRMAN. What were you going to say, Mr. McGuinness?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I don't want to get into a political debate.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, do you think their efforts were somewhat successful in suppressing this picture?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes. I believe they hurt the picture to some extent largely because of agitation against it, which coincided with the attack on Pearl Harbor, which preceded the release of the picture.

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer decided that anything which might create any kind of disturbance within our country at that time was inadvisable, and not a contribution to the war effort, so they made no exploitation campaign based on this agitation and merely released the picture in a routine form.

MR. SMITH. When did the Communists start penetrating the motion-picture industry, to your knowledge?

MR. McGUINNESS. I would say the Communists began to penetrate the motion-picture industry in the early thirties; that with the growth of the threat of Hitler and nazism they rose and were able to enlist the support of many fine people who naturally wanted to fight fascism.

During the Spanish civil war there was great sympathy in many quarters in Hollywood for the cause of the Loyalists. This influence waned during the Hitler-Stalin pact, which revolted against many fair-minded people, and it rose to its greatest height under the very favorable climate provided when Russia and ourselves were allies during the war.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. McGuinness, in regard to that penetration, the Communists have not only penetrated the motion-picture industry, they have penetrated labor, education, and Government; so when we investigate communism in the motion-picture industry we are not taking any rights away from the industry; we are not in any way trying to censor the movies. What we are doing is just investigating communism in another field.

Therefore, I think it is a mistake for anyone to think that the motion-picture industry has a special privilege of immunity.

Isn't that also your belief?

MR. McGUINNESS. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to hear the Chair state that. I would like to state my own personal and deep conviction that the very vast majority of the men and women who work in the motion-picture industry are as fine and patriotic Americans as will be found anywhere else on earth.

But I think with an ideological conflict tearing the world to pieces there is no reason why Hollywood should be the one white spot that escaped this plague.

THE CHAIRMAN. That is right. These 79 persons that I named before are not just the run-of-the-mill; they are very prominent persons, prominent in the industry, and those are the people that we have the records on; those are people whose records are going to be brought out before this hearing is over. Do you not think they should be?

MR. McGUINNESS. I think that the greatest fight that can be made against communism is to identify the Communists and to force them to take the responsibility that every other American takes, to appear publicly, state, advocate, and support his own beliefs, and be judged by the American people as to whether those beliefs are worth while, or not.

THE CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

MR. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, has there been any concerted effort on the part of any studio to eliminate this group of people?

MR. McGUINNESS. Well, as Mr. Jack Warner testified, he made an effort—I think a successful one. I think great caution has been exercised by the management of the Paramount Studios. I think a

varying degree and a lesser degree of vigilance—or realization, which I think is a better word—has been shown by other studios.

However, since I testified in Los Angeles this spring, I am happy to say there has been a growing awareness in the motion-picture industry of the menace of communism; that it has been fought in all the unions and the guilds, and successfully in most of them.

MR. SMITH. As an executive at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, what do you think about the condition there?

MR. MCGUINNESS. I don't think it is the whitest condition in the industry. I think we have our share of Communists in our employ.

MR. SMITH. You stated you feel it has been successfully combated in the guilds. Is that your opinion as to the Screen Writers Guild?

MR. MCGUINNESS. I qualified that by saying some of the guilds. I do not believe it has been successfully combated in the Screen Writers Guild.

There is a group in the guild now attempting to organize and to present at a forthcoming election a slate of candidates opposed to communism.

MR. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, do you know who Alvah Bessie is?

MR. MCGUINNESS. Yes.

MR. SMITH. Who is he?

MR. MCGUINNESS. Alvah Bessie is a former movie critic of the New Masses who came to Hollywood, I think—yes, in the employ of Warner Bros. He was known amongst writers I knew on the Warner Bros. lot as the party's hatchet man.

MR. SMITH. Do you consider the New Masses a Communist publication?

MR. MCGUINNESS. I do.

MR. SMITH. If a studio releases a person who is suspected of communistic activities would he be blackballed in other studios?

MR. MCGUINNESS. No.

MR. SMITH. What would happen, in your opinion?

MR. MCGUINNESS. Hitherto he has usually been promptly hired and sometimes, or perhaps frequently, at an increased salary.

MR. SMITH. Do you think that is a bad situation in the industry?

MR. MCGUINNESS. I would like to answer that a little at length.

I believe there is no legal obligation on anybody to hire anybody, nor is there any legal compulsion on anybody to fire anybody. I would regret that any man was deprived of his livelihood for his political opinions no matter how abhorrent those opinions are to me.

I think, however, there is an obligation on the Congress of the United States as great or greater than on the citizens, who have sworn to defend this country against all its enemies, foreign or domestic, to recognize that we have in our midst an active fifth column, a group of Quislings who intend to destroy our form of government in the service of a foreign ideology.

MR. SMITH. How many writers would you think the industry would lose; that is, top-flight writers, if all the Communist writers were released?

MR. MCGUINNESS. Among the important writers, that is, the actually top-flight writers, somewhere between 10 and 15.

MR. SMITH. How many pictures a year do you think the studios would lose?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Well, if those 10 or 15 writers were more productive than usual, the same number of pictures.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, do you think it would materially hurt the studio operation?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Not in my opinion.

Mr. SMITH. Do you know of any reasons why the studios tended not to release these individuals?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes. To tell you that I must try, as briefly as possible, to sketch the studio situation.

Each studio has as paid employees a staff of producers who have the ultimate responsibility for the production of individual pictures. It is a highly competitive business and each of these men, since he is held responsible for the ultimate success or failure of the picture, has great latitude in the selection of the writer who will prepare the script, and frequently the director who will direct the picture.

He usually has a very great say in the casting of the picture. That trust must be imposed on him by the head of the studio who cannot personally produce each picture.

These men charged with production are primarily showmen and not men deeply informed on the dialectics of communism. They are more concerned with getting the best possible script than with anything else.

If some writer who has had a number of successes is available at the time they start a script, they will exercise every effort to get him because a good script is the primary insurance of a successful picture.

I doubt that any of the heads of studios participate in the selection of the writers assigned to each script. I think it is humanly impossible with their other duties for the men running the studios to go that deeply into the detail of production.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, how many members are there in the Screen Writers Guild, approximately?

Mr. McGUINNESS. At the present time there are approximately 1,000, perhaps a few less, active members, which means members who can vote at the guild meetings. There are approximately 300 associate members who are members not qualified to vote. The qualification for voting membership in the Screen Writers Guild is very low.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, there would be about 1,000 that you think are permanently unemployed in the guild?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I wanted to say that because of this low qualification for membership I believe any man who has worked 13 weeks in any 2 years is eligible to vote, whether or not he has written anything that ever reaches the screen. The industry normally furnishes employment, upward and downward, for 350 writers. That means that within the Screen Writers Guild there are approximately 1,000 members permanently unemployable.

This creates a very fertile field for agitation, resentment, propagandizing, and profiting by the discontent or the unsuccessful.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, I gather from that that the people who are not employed as writers in the industry can control this guild of some 1,300 people?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I believe that at almost every Screen Writers Guild meeting more votes are cast by men and women unemployed than are cast by men and women who are employed.

Mr. SMITH. What are some of the dangers in the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think I pointed that out in the situation in which a guild, functioning as a union, has so many unemployable members. I remember discussing this situation once with several of the important A. F. of L. leaders in the Los Angeles area. I cited it to them and said, "What do you think this situation is? Do you think it is healthy?" The reply was, "If we have 10 men unemployable in a local of 1,000 members we can expect fireworks."

Mr. SMITH. What I had in mind was this: How are they able to control the new writers, the younger writers, and readers through the guilds?

Mr. McGUINNESS. The manner of control of younger writers varies. I think the first approach is to the youthful idealism and the youthful sense of revolt, which is healthy and should be expected. If that fails, young writers who in the past, at least, have been sympathetic and followed along with the party line in the guild, have had more encouragement, have had their professional efforts supported and pushed by the tight clique in control of the guild, the writers who do not conform, the young writers find themselves largely isolated and not helped in the furthering of their careers.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, will you explain the operation of the reading department?

Mr. McGUINNESS. To explain that I must tell you that the industry as a whole produces in a normal year approximately 500 feature-length pictures. The material for those pictures comes in very small measure from the successful plays and the best-seller novels. I would suppose that that type of material furnishes 20 to 30 feature-length pictures a year.

Naturally, that material is familiar to every head of a studio, to every producer, to every executive, to every director because there is intense bidding in a very open and competitive market to obtain the motion-picture rights to highly successful material.

But the necessity of motion-picture release and the demand of theaters for products leaves us with perhaps 450 to 470 pictures still to be obtained. A great flow of material comes to the reading department of every studio. It would be impossible for any executive or for any head of any studio to read one-tenth of that material, even if he devoted his entire time to it and did no other work.

So, the job of sorting out the material, the run-of-the-mill flow, falls to the reading department which can decide to synopsise or not synopsise, according to the judgment exercised there as to the quality of the material.

From these synopses, and about 15 or 20 reach my desk each week, selection is made of the most promising material, and that is then considered in its full form.

Those members of the Story Analysts Guild who are sympathetic to or followers of the Communist Party, are in a position to promote, all things being equal, one submitted piece of material coming from people sympathetic to their cause, and to suppress material coming from anybody unsympathetic to their cause.

Now, I want you to understand that cannot be done in the cases of highly important or highly promising material. There would then

be the danger that other studios might buy it, make a successful picture, and an investigation would be made as to why at one particular studio that was not submitted.

But in many cases the quality of the picture does not depend so much on what selection is made originally from the run-of-the-mill material, but on the additional values given to that material by the screen writer, the producer, the director, and by the importance of the cast put in the picture.

Mr. SMITH. Was it your observation that they actually do attempt to control these young readers in that manner?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I believe they do, and I believe to a good extent they have been successful. I might say that since I first testified to this there has been a healthier and better situation developing in that very guild.

Mr. SMITH. You mentioned a few pictures a while ago that you thought were pro-Soviet pictures. During the time those pictures were made were there any anti-Communist pictures made by any of the studios, to your knowledge?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Not during the war period. Mr. Mayer mentioned two made at my studio, *Ninotchka* and *Comrade XI*, prior to the outbreak of the war.

Mr. SMITH. Do you think some anti-Communist pictures should be made?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I certainly do.

Mr. SMITH. Do you mean shorts or full-length pictures, or both?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Both.

The CHAIRMAN. Right along that point, Mr. McGuinness, why is it they are not being made?

Mr. McGUINNESS. It takes a long while from the inception of the idea of producing a picture until it actually gets before the screen. Sometimes it takes a year's work on the script, sometimes 2 years' work. You have to find a story. You must remember it is not so long since Russia was our ally. Nobody at that time wanted to make an anti-Communist picture.

It took some time for the hope that we would eventually reach an understanding with Russia to fade. I think now some studios have already found strong anti-Communist material, and others are searching for it.

I think that when the first picture is made public reaction to it will determine how many more will or will not follow.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard the testimony yesterday, did you?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard one of the witnesses say that if they did make an anti-Communist film the movie houses would be picketed, stink bombs would be used, and the audience would be discouraged and people would not attend. What have you to say on that point?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think that threat has been used in the past. I would hate to think that the industry as a whole, if confronted with that threat, would not have the courage to face it.

However, theaters are very vulnerable places economically. As Mr. Hughes pointed out, one stink bomb in a theater is a very disastrous occurrence. Motion pictures live from their day-by-day receipts. If you lose a week's receipts in theaters throughout the country it is a very serious financial matter. Our product is time; our market is

time. There are only 52 weeks in the year. If we lose 1 week out of the 52 we have lost one-fifty-second of the revenue and we can never recover it.

Mr. NIXON: As a matter of fact, Mr. McGuinness, if those tactics—the stench bomb, the pickets, and the usual tactics which are used by the Communists when they don't like what is going on in the theater, or in any kind of a building—were used, wouldn't that be the finest advertising that a motion picture could get and wouldn't that probably make the picture from the standpoint of public acceptance?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I personally believe it would. I think it would be embarrassing to the manager of the theater concerned and create a local problem, but I think nationally the American people would rally to the support of a picture that was attacked for the expression of a viewpoint that I think is the viewpoint of the Nation today.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, a picture telling the truth about totalitarian communism, setting forth the facts—and such a picture, we assume, would be an anti-Communist picture. But a picture doing that would be a really good business gamble from the standpoint of the industry, in your opinion?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think it would be a good business gamble, and I think it is a necessary moral obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, has the industry the will to make anti-Communist pictures?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think the industry is acquiring it.

Mr. Chairman, our community, Hollywood, the motion-picture community, offered refuge to many vocal, articulate people who escaped from the lash of Hitler. They were artists, actors, musicians, writers. They were accustomed to expressing themselves, and they brought home very forcibly to Hollywood the dangers of the Fascist and Nazi regime. I could only wish that a small proportion of the same people who have suffered under Stalin could come out from behind the iron curtain and reach Hollywood and spread their message there, too. I think it would be very helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McGuinness, will these public hearings aid the industry in giving it the will to make these pictures?

Mr. McGUINNESS. It is my opinion that they will.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other member have any questions at this point?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Is MGM making any—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. Is counsel through?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. SMITH. No—

Mr. WOOD. Well, I will wait until counsel is through.

Mr. SMITH. Is MGM making any anti-Communist pictures at this time, to your knowledge?

Mr. McGUINNESS. We are making a picture, the original title of which was *The Red Danube*. It is a novel by Bruce Marshall, a Scotchman, and a very excellent writer. I believe that the novel was released by the Book of the Month Club, with the changed title *Vespers in Vienna*. I do not know at this time what title we will use on the pic-

ture. Certainly, I favor *The Red Danube*. I think that this can be a first-rate picture, in that the novel, itself, which is written by a Catholic, presents the problem in occupied Vienna, in the clash between the western democratic theory of existence and the totalitarian expressed by the Russians in that same area.

MR. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, you heard the chairman state a while ago that there was communism not only in the industry but in other places where it is a grave danger. It is my recollection that during the war the various studios made a number of patriotic pictures and disseminated them through the schools and other places to assist in the patriotic war effort. Why can't the studios do that as far as anti-Communist pictures are concerned and circulate them through the schools and churches to assist in fighting this problem?

MR. MCGUINNESS. The studios during the war, and as a very patriotic service, and of which I and everybody in the motion-picture industry is proud, furnished shorts for the Government—made them in the studios, processed them, sent prints to their various exchanges, and charged nothing except for the actual raw material of the film and the labor costs of the technicians employed. No overhead or no profit ever was charged on any one of the shorts made for the Government. They were sent to the theatres without charge for playing time.

I think if the industry became convinced of this emergency and was approached again on the necessity of doing a patriotic and public duty, that some of these films might very well be made and apportioned among the various studios to make.

MR. SMITH. You heard a number of people mentioned as being communistically inclined in the various studios. As a practical matter, don't you feel that their opposition would be such that it would be extremely difficult for a studio to make such a picture?

MR. MCGUINNESS. I think that a year, or perhaps 6 months, ago, that opposition which is tight and well organized and had not then been identified conceivably could have hampered the production of such pictures, persuaded people that they were not liberal if they made an anti-Communist picture, or by various devices which they use, including in some cases intimidation, could certainly have hampered such an effort.

I feel that today there is a greater conscious danger and that their efforts would by no means be so successful today as they might have been 6 months or a year ago.

MR. SMITH. Can you give us any other examples as to how the Communists have misused Hollywood?

MR. MCGUINNESS. Yes; I think that one of the greatest disservices that the Communists have done to Hollywood has been in their very clever use of the name "Hollywood" or motion pictures in the titles of various front organizations. Hollywood has a glamor value that attracts crowds, particularly when you get out of the Hollywood area where the glamor personalities are a day-by-day occurrence and so are permitted to live fairly normal lives. But the presence of a motion-picture name billing a Communist-front rally, or a front-organization rally, is highly successful in attracting crowds to such a rally who normally would not be attracted to the rally itself.

I have never seen one of these rallies at which a collection was not taken up and at which some substantial sum was not raised.

MR. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, my investigation reflects that it isn't necessary for these Communist writers to actually put any material into pictures, but that it is possible for them to receive large salaries each week and from that salary donate to the Communist Party and actually further and operate their activities throughout the United States.

Is it your opinion that that can be done, being affiliated in the studios?

MR. MCGUINNESS. I think that is done. I think that substantial sums of money are raised in Hollywood, or raised through the advertising power of Hollywood personalities.

I also think if the industry was surveyed and every picture it has made for the last 10 years appraised that the weight of evidence in favor of constructive American pictures on the screen would be preponderantly in the favor of the industry and its patriotism. But I do not maintain, and I could not maintain, that vigilance has been so successful that nothing has ever crept by.

I want to state, as Mr. Menjou did, that I believe no head of any studio with whom I am acquainted—and I also know most of them over a great period of years—would consciously allow any propaganda that served a Communist purpose to get on the screen. But I do not think we have been infallible. I think we have stubbed our toe occasionally. I think we will do it less in the future.

MR. SMITH. Do you feel, Mr. McGuinness, that they have plenty of time and that if they get more writers and more leaders and more control as the time goes on that the vigilance will become more difficult and they then can at some time in the future take over?

MR. MCGUINNESS. I believe this: There has been a long strike, one of the longest in the labor history in the United States, going on in Hollywood. That strike began with a very strong supporting group of guilds which had been organized and brought together by Herbert K. Sorrell, about whom there has been considerable testimony before this committee. It was an amusing feature of his organizational work that some years ago he issued cards as painters to the Screen Office employees who were the stenographers, the clerks, and the telephone operators; also to the General Publicists Guild—and there may be some justification for thinking the press agents paint—and also to the Story Analysts Guild. However, when the strike was called many of these guilds rebelled against the idea of respecting picket lines by order from headquarters. Membership meetings were held at which the issue was forced to a vote of the membership. In the case of the Screen Office Employees Guild they voted not to respect the strike, and they subsequently broke away from the painters' union and re-organized themselves as the separate Office Workers Employees Guild under charter from the American Federation of Labor. Had Sorrell and his group won that strike, which, incidentally, was supported to the utmost by the controlling group of the Screen Writers Guild—they attempted to get the Directors Guild or the Actors Guild to support the strike, also to the extent of not crossing picket lines, and they were unsuccessful in that attempt—but had they succeeded they would have had a tight hold on many of the important guilds and unions, the craft unions, within the industry. This would have been attained at a time when the present Screen Writers Guild contract with the producers has only about a year or 15 months to run.

In the renegotiation of that contract they would have been in a position to insist on control of their own material, and that if it is ever achieved will be the end of the free screen in America.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. McGuinness, as I recall your testimony, you have stated that you believe these Communists were enemies—of a foreign agent—or agents of a foreign government.

Mr. MCGUINNESS. I believe them to be definitely in the service of a foreign government. I do not know whether all of them consciously know they are, but the directives come to them from on high, and they carry them out.

Mr. SMITH. Have you any further suggestions for the consideration of this committee as to how to combat this serious problem?

Mr. MCGUINNESS. I think that the first and primary requisite is education of the American public to the menace that exists and to the methods used in the unions, in the guilds, and in the various mediums of communication by party members and party liners.

I believe beyond that, as I said before, that legislation is necessary. I would be reluctant to see legislation directed at anyone for his political beliefs, but I believe that the time will come when it is vital for the continued existence of our Nation to recognize this enemy in our midst as an enemy. We cannot sacrifice our own freedom to those who are using it for the purpose of destroying freedom.

Mr. SMITH. Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. McGuinness, I gather from your testimony that you have never had occasion to question the loyalty and the patriotism of any of the picture producers or responsible studio heads?

Mr. MCGUINNESS. I not only don't question it, I assert that they are loyal and patriotic.

Mr. WOOD. Counsel has asked you a question as to whether or not in your own opinion the effect of the elimination from the industry of these writers and others who are recognized as embracing communist doctrines would weaken the efficiency of the industry, itself, and I understood you to say that in your opinion it wouldn't; isn't that correct?

Mr. MCGUINNESS. That is correct.

Mr. WOOD. You did state, however, as I recall, that you would not advocate any legislation or action of any sort that would deprive a man of his livelihood by reason of his political beliefs?

Mr. MCGUINNESS. I did.

Mr. WOOD. To which sentiment I subscribe heartily. But there are nations in this world of ours today that practice a political philosophy that is embraced and is being preached by people who subscribe to that faith in this country; isn't that right?

Mr. MCGUINNESS. Yes.

Mr. WOOD. And don't you think it would be a sort of considerable educational value if those people should ply their trade and engage in their activities in countries that are controlled by that philosophy?

Mr. MCGUINNESS. I think that would be ideal. I don't know whether you can achieve it or not.

Mr. WOOD. And do you know of any instance in which any person of that political belief in this country would have any difficulty in obtaining access to the countries that recognize that political philosophy?

MR. McGUINNESS. Well, from what I have read, the Soviet Union is very much more selective about whom they accept. I believe that some of our Soviet and Communist sympathizers might be acceptable—I don't know whether all will be acceptable—to the Soviet Union.

MR. WOOD. Do you know of any instance in which any of them who advocate that political philosophy have ever had any difficulty in obtaining entrance into any country that is dominated by that school of thought?

MR. McGUINNESS. No; I do not.

MR. WOOD. Well, have you read this morning's editorial in the Washington Post?

MR. McGUINNESS. No. I think there was a cartoon in it that I saw.

MR. WOOD. It had, to me, a very interesting editorial, somewhat taking to task certain members of the industry who have appeared here as witnesses because of their pronounced unwillingness to assume the legal implications that might be involved by concerted action on the part of the responsible heads of the industry to eliminate this class of people from their employment, and in view of the recent decisions of the Supreme Court and a court of one of our States, particularly New York, to the effect that the term "communism" is such an odious term that it formed the foundation for an action in damages and in libel against a person who might apply it to another. Don't you think that the responsible studio heads of this country have at least some justification in their unwillingness by their concerted action to undertake to eliminate men from their employment for that reason?

MR. McGUINNESS. I am not a lawyer, but I believe that legally concerted action might be deemed conspiracy.

MR. WOOD. It is difficult in this country to prove that a man is a Communist; isn't it?

MR. McGUINNESS. It is. My own observation of what constitutes a Communist has been based somewhat on this principle, that if a man goes into a saloon every night for 10 years I have to presume that he didn't go there to get a lemonade. I also follow the pattern of behavior established by Attorney General Biddle of the various twists and turns of the Communist Party in relation to the Hitler-Stalin pact period when it was an imperialist war, the change of front and attitude when Hitler attacked Stalin, the demand then that we go all out to aid the Allies, and the subsequent demand for a second front.

I might add that since the Attorney General has left office there is the additional return to the revolutionary technique, on the basis of the Jacques Ducloux letter which ordered the American party to get rid of its boss.

THE CHAIRMAN. May we have more order, please.

MR. WOOD. In view, then, of the legal implications that are involved, and that might at least be put in force, do you think a charge against the responsible heads of the moving-picture industry in America that they had been derelict in their duty for not conspiring together to eliminate people from their industry because of their political beliefs is a little bit unfair?

MR. McGUINNESS. I think that that charge is unfair. I advocate no conspiracy by any group of men, including the Communists. I think that each producer or head of a studio must decide for himself what his attitude is.

Mr. Wood. Wouldn't it be very simple, in your opinion, Mr. McGuinness, if the Congress would simply by amendatory legislation provide that the controlling heads of any industry may, if they have reasonable grounds to conclude that a man is engaged in activities detrimental to this Government, and aiding a philosophy that is designed to overthrow it, would have the right to eliminate them and that other people in that industry would have the right to decline to employ them for that reason, without fear of future legal implications?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I agree with that in principle, Mr. Wood.

Mr. Wood. Thank you.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. McGuinness, in attempting to influence the motion pictures one way or another, either in keeping out the facts about communism or in keeping out the facts about the American way of life or distorting those facts, what would you say was the more important: The writer or the actor?

Mr. McGUINNESS. The writer.

Mr. NIXON. The actor has probably very little control on that particular score and could do very little?

Mr. McGUINNESS. It depends on his importance. Most stars are listened to and their opinions carry weight—

Mr. NIXON. Well—

Mr. McGUINNESS (continuing). About a script, but very few of them, if any, have a veto power on what pictures they appear in.

Mr. NIXON. But in the making of the actual picture itself, the writer is by far the more important of the two?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Oh, yes.

Mr. NIXON. And the same would be true in relationship to the director and the actor?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes; I think the director is more important in forming and framing the picture than the actor.

Mr. NIXON. That is right. So, as far as the Communists are concerned, their primary aim in Hollywood, if they are attempting to influence the motion pictures in one way or another, is to attempt to enlist the support first of writers and, second, of directors and probably a very poor third of actors.

Mr. McGUINNESS. I don't think that they have neglected the actors, but I think for their purposes—

Mr. NIXON. For their purposes—

Mr. McGUINNESS (continuing). The order you establish is correct.

Mr. NIXON. Yes; and if they have been extremely successful, or relatively successful, in obtaining the support of writers and directors, they have accomplished their purpose to an extent, at least?

Mr. McGUINNESS. They have to an extent. Not completely.

Mr. NIXON. Now, during the war you said that the Communist writers were given a leave of absence, as you put it, to write pictures which showed America in a favorable light. Do you mean by that that before that time, and since that time, they did not have a leave of absence to tell the true facts about America?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Since the Duclos letter—we had described in quite some detail yesterday the series of discussions or articles in the Communist press, in which as a final result Mr. Albert Maltz was

forced to eat his own words, disciplined, and had to confess error and return to what he termed the Marxist basis for all writers. That is what I mean by the terminology "leave of absence."

Mr. NIXON. I see. So at the present time the Communist writers in Hollywood, or those who are following the Communist line, do not have, as you put it, a so-called leave of absence to either, one, tell the true facts about America, and, two, tell the true facts about totalitarian communism.

Mr. McGUINNESS. I believe that to be the condition.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, the situation at the present time is that those who are following the Communist line as writers in Hollywood are under direction to distort the facts about America and to suppress the facts about totalitarian communism?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I believe that to be true.

Mr. NIXON. Well, in view of that fact, if you had, as a studio executive, in your employ writers who you knew were, (1) either members of the Communist Party—which might be unlikely, I admit, from the standpoint of proof—or, (2) who had consistently followed the Communist line, would you feel that if they were to remain in your employ they would have to be watched very carefully from the standpoint of the type of pictures that they produced and their activities in attempting to control the pictures in some way?

Mr. McGUINNESS. Yes; I believe they should be watched with vigilance continually.

Mr. NIXON. And the reason you feel that they would have to be watched is that because they do follow the line which you have explained these writers, and directors as well, assuming that some of those would be involved, constitute a potential danger to the industry and to the country as well in that what they advocate and what they are working for would destroy the principles which you believe in and which most of us in America believe in?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I believe that the only group in the United States organized for the purpose of exercising thought control is the Communist group and if they ever got control of the industry nothing would ever appear on the screen but their own conception of what was best for all of us.

Mr. NIXON. So, if a motion picture does not, as far as the Communist writer or sympathizer is concerned, as we have put it before, distort the facts about America, or suppress the facts about communistic Russia, then is it not true that those people in Hollywood proceed to call such pictures or people who attempt to promote such pictures Fascists, un-American, and enemies of free speech—anti-liberals?

Mr. McGUINNESS. They call us all that, and I could elaborate the list.

Mr. NIXON. You mean you don't want to say anything that can't go over the air?

Mr. McGUINNESS. That is right.

Mr. NIXON. And so, in your opinion, the most violent opponents of a free screen in Hollywood, and of free speech, are the Communists and the Communist Party liners, because as far as they are concerned they oppose unequivocally telling the truth and the facts about Communist Russia, or anything that would in any way criticize communism in Russia, or any other totalitarian Communist country and

because they deliberately attempt to distort the facts about America?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I agree with that absolutely. I think they are a continuing menace to free speech and free expression.

Mr. NIXON. And these are the same people who are saying that this committee, in this hearing today, in attempting to point out the activities that they have been indulging in—this suppression of facts and distorting the facts—is attempting to control the free screen in Hollywood?

Mr. McGUINNESS. They say it; I don't believe it.

Mr. NIXON. In other words—

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think—I beg your pardon?

Mr. NIXON. Go ahead.

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think this is, again, the use of the Communist fear technique, and if the witnesses who have appeared here had not been so consistently smeared for their attitude and became sort of calloused to the smearing attack of the Communists I think they would have succeeded by that very cry of "Red-baiter," "witch hunt," "un-American." They might have succeeded in intimidating some of the witnesses. I think that was their basic and primary purpose.

Mr. NIXON. And if the Communists in Hollywood were left alone, in Hollywood and in other places where they have access to information media in this country, and no efforts were made to point out their activities so the people could judge them for what they were, and they thereby could accomplish their purposes, that would be the end of free speech, a free screen, and free radio in America?

Mr. McGUINNESS. It would.

Mr. NIXON. I agree with you that once they are out in the open they should say what they want to say.

That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell—

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, before you proceed, I wonder if we could place in the record the articles by Albert Maltz to which the witness referred and which were referred to yesterday?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.²⁴

(The documents referred to are as follows:)

WHAT SHALL WE ASK OF WRITERS?

By Albert Maltz

(New Masses, February 12, 1946, p. 19)

Isidor Schneider's frank and earnest article on writers' problems (NM, October 23, 1945) is very welcome. In attempting to add to his discussion, I ask that my observations be taken for what they are: The comments of a working writer, not the presentation of a formal esthetician. It is likely that some of my statements are too sweeping, others badly formulated. I urge that the attention of readers, however, be directed to the problem itself, rather than to formulations which may be imperfect. All who are earnestly desirous of a rich, expanding literature in America have the obligation of charting the course. This common effort must not languish while we search for unassailable definitions.

It has been my conclusion for some time that much of left-wing artistic activity—both creative and critical—has been restricted, narrowed, turned away from life, sometimes made sterile—because the atmosphere and thinking of the literary left wing has been based upon a shallow approach. Let me add that the

²⁴ See appendix, p. 529, for exhibits 34-36.

left wing has also offered a number of vital intellectual assets to the writer—such as its insistence that important writing cannot be socially idle—that it must be humane in content, etc. Schneider enumerated these assets and I take them here for granted. But right now it is essential to discuss where things have gone wrong—why and how.

I believe that the effects of the shallow approach I have mentioned—like a poison in the blood stream—largely cause the problems Schneider mentioned. Indeed, these problems are merely the pustules upon the body, the sign of ill health.

Let me underscore that I am referring only to artistic activity, not to journalism. Schneider differentiates generally between writing for the moment and writing enduring works. There are other ways of phrasing this distinction, but his is a useful one—provided it is not taken with mechanical literalness. For instance, certain works have been written for the moment which nevertheless prove to contain enduring values. Such examples do not alter the true meaning of Schneider's categories.

Schneider went on to state, correctly, that: “* * * to report immediate events or to propagandize for immediate objectives * * * is an honorable as well as a useful function. (John Reed * * * Ehrenburg.) The harm,” he added, “is in confusing the two. Some writers have sought to solve a conflict of conscience by trying to do the two in one” (i. e., journalism and art). “They have written books in such a way as also to serve immediate political expediences. The results showed either in weakened and schematic writing—or wasted writing.”

In these remarks, Schneider recognizes the problem, describes it accurately—but does not go on to uncover the deep source of it. Left-wing writers have been confused; yes. But why?

The answer, I believe, is this: Most writers on the left have been confused. “The conflict of conscience,” resulting in wasted writing or bad art, has been induced in the writer by the intellectual atmosphere of the left wing. The errors of individual writers or critics largely flow from a central source, I believe. That source is the vulgarization of the theory of art which lies behind left-wing thinking, namely, “art is a weapon.”

Let me emphasize that, properly and broadly interpreted, I accept this doctrine to be true. The ideas, ethical concepts, credos upon which a writer draws consciously or unconsciously are those of his period. In turn, the accepted beliefs of any period reflect those values which are satisfactory to the class holding dominant social power. To the degree that works of art reflect or attack these values, it is broadly—not always specifically—true to say that works of art have been, and can be, weapons in men's thinking, and therefore in the struggle of social classes, either on the side of humanity's progress, or on the side of reaction. But as interpreted in practice for the last 15 years of the left wing in America, it has become a hard rock of narrow thinking. The total concept, “art is a weapon,” has been viewed as though it consisted of only one word: “weapon.” The nature of art—how art may best be a weapon, and how it may not be—has been slurred over. I have come to believe that the accepted understanding of art as a weapon is not a useful guide, but a strait-jacket. I have felt this in my own works and viewed it in the works of others. In order to write at all, it has long since become necessary for me to repudiate it and abandon it.

Whatever its original stimulating utility in the late twenties or the early thirties, this doctrine, “art is a weapon,” over the years in day-to-day wear and tear was converted from a profound analytic, historical insight into a vulgar slogan: “Art should be a weapon.” This, in turn, was even more narrowly interpreted into the following: “Art should be a weapon as a leaflet is a weapon.” Finally, in practice, it has been understood to mean that unless art is a weapon like a leaflet, serving immediate political ends, necessities, and programs, it is worthless or escapist or vicious.

The result of this abuse and misuse of a concept upon the critic's apparatus of approach has been, and must be, disastrous. From it flow all of the constrictions and—we must be honest—stupidities too often found in the earnest but narrow thinking and practice of the literary left wing in these past years. And this has been inevitable.

First of all, under the domination of this vulgarized approach, creative works are judged primarily by their formal ideology. What else can happen if art is a weapon as a leaflet is a weapon? If a work, however thin or inept as a piece of literary fabric, expresses ideas that seem to fit the correct political tactics of the time, it is a foregone conclusion that it will be reviewed warmly, if not enthusi-

astically. But if the work, no matter how high in human insight, character portrayal, and imagination, seems to imply "wrong" political conclusions, then it will be indicted, severely mauled, or beheaded, as the case may be.

Let me give a recent example of this unhappy pattern: When Lillian Hellman's magnificent play, *Watch on the Rhine*, was produced in 1940, the *New Masses'* critic attacked it. When it appeared, unaltered, as a film in 1942, the *New Masses'* critic hailed it. The changed attitude came not from the fact that two different critics were involved, but from the fact that events had transpired in the 2 years calling for a different political program. This work of art was not viewed on either occasion as to its real quality, its deep revelation of life, character, and the social scene, but primarily as to whether or not it was the proper "leaflet" for the moment.

There is an opposite error, corollary to this: *New Masses'* critics have again and again praised works as art that no one—themselves included—would bother to read now, 10 years later. In fact, it once even gave a prize to such a book. This is not due to the fact that those who have written criticism for the magazine have personally been without taste or intelligence or integrity. The evil lies in the abandonment of taste because a shallow approach does not permit it. Literary taste can only operate in a crippled manner when canons of immediate political utility are the primary values of judgment to be applied indiscriminately to all books.

Again, from this type of thinking comes that approach which demands of each written work that it contain "the whole truth." An author writes a novel, let us say, about an unemployed Negro during the depression. The central character, after many harsh vicissitudes, ends by stealing and is sent to the penitentiary. If a book with this content were to be richly rendered, it might be highly illuminating in its portrayal of an aspect of Negro life in America. But, again and again I have seen such works, justifiably confined to only one sector of experience, severely criticized because they do not contain "the whole truth." Upon examination this "whole truth" reveals itself to be purely political. The narrow critic is demanding that the novelist also show that some unemployed Negroes join the unemployed councils, etc. This demand, which I have seen repeated in varied ways in the pages of the *New Masses*, rests upon the psychological assumption that readers come to each book with an empty head. They know nothing, understand nothing. Therefore, all they will ever know of Negro life in America must be contained in this book. Therefore, if the author has omitted to say that some unemployed Negroes join organizations, it is a deficient book because it doesn't contain "the whole truth," and it doesn't properly fill the total vacuum of the reader's mind.

The creative writer, respecting this type of criticism, is faced with insuperable difficulties. He is confronted with the apparent obligation of writing both a novel and an editorial that will embrace all current political propositions remotely touching his material. Whether or not his character would join the unemployed council is of no matter; whether or not the material and artistic concept of the book forbid the examination of other characters—that, too, is of no matter. By hook or crook the material must be so rendered that the whole political "truth" of the scene is made visible, and the empty-handed reader is thereby won to new horizons—Q. E. D.

This is not a method by which art can be made rich, or the artist freed to do his most useful work. Let those who deny this ask working writers.

From this narrow approach to art another error also follows rather automatically. If, in actual practice—no matter how we revere art—we assume that a writer making a speech is performing the same act as writing a novel, then we are helpless to judge works written by those who make the "wrong" sort of speeches. Engels was never bothered by this problem. For instance, he said of Balzac—I paraphrase—that Balzac taught him more about the social structure of France than all of the economists, sociologists, etc., of the period. But who was Balzac? He was a Royalist, consistently and virulently antidemocratic, anti-Socialist, anti-Communist in his thinking as a citizen.

In his appreciation of Balzac, Engels understood two facts about art: First, as I have already stated, the writer, qua citizen, making an election speech, and the writer, qua artist, writing a novel, is performing two very different acts. Second, Engels understood that a writer may be confused, or even stupid and reactionary in thinking—and yet it is possible for him to do good, even great, work as an artist—work that even serves ends he despises. This point is critical for an understanding of art and artists. An artist can be a great artist without being an integrated or a logical or a progressive thinker on all matters. This is so

because he presents not a systematized philosophy but the imaginative reconstruction of a sector of human experience. Indeed, most people do not think with thoroughlygoing logic. We are all acquainted with Jews who understand the necessity of fighting fascism, but who do not see the relationship between fascism and their own discrimination toward Negroes. We know Negroes who fight discrimination against themselves, but are anti-Semitic. I am acquainted with the curator of a museum who has made distinguished contributions in his scientific field, but who sees no contradiction between his veneration for science and his racist attitude toward Negroes. Out of these same human failings many artists are able to lead an intellectual life that often has a dual character. Ideas which they may consciously hold or reject do not always seriously affect their field of work where, operating like a scientist upon specific material, they sometimes handle an aspect of human experience with passionate honesty in spite of the fact that the very implications of what they are writing may contradict ideas they consciously hold.

For instance, in sections of *Grapes of Wrath* John Steinbeck writes a veritable poem to revolution. Yet we would be making an error to draw conclusions from this about Steinbeck's personal philosophy or to be surprised when he writes *Cannery Row* with its mystic paean to Bohemianism. Similarly we can point to John Galsworthy, a successful, wealthy, middle-class Englishman. As a thinker, Galsworthy may not have understood the meaning of the phrase "class justice." But as an artist, honestly and earnestly recreating what he saw in English society, he wrote two plays, the *Silver Box* and *Justice*, which gave a searing portrait of class justice in human terms, and which no socially conscious, theoretically sagacious, left-wing writer of today has come within 200 miles of equaling.

Unless this is understood, the critics on the left will not be able to deal with the literary work of their time. Writers must be judged by their work and not by the committees they join. It is the job of the editorial section of a magazine to praise or attack citizens' committees for what they stand for. It is the job of the literary critics to praise the literary works only.

The best case in point, although there are many, is James T. Farrell. Farrell is, in my opinion—and I have thought so ever since reading *Studs Lonigan* over 10 years ago—one of the outstanding writers in America. I have not liked all of his work equally, and I don't like the committees he belongs to. But he wrote a superb trilogy and more than a few short stories of great quality, and he is not through writing yet. *Studs Lonigan* endures and is read by increasing numbers. It will endure, in my opinion, and deserves to. But if, in my opinion, Farrell is to be judged solely by his personality or his political position, then the *New Masses* is left in the position of either ignoring his work or attacking it. Let's face it. Isn't this exactly what has happened? Farrell's name was a bright penant in the *New Masses* until he became hostile to the *New Masses*. Very well; for his deeds or misdeeds as a citizen, let him be editorially appraised. But his literary work cannot be ignored, and must not be ignored. And, if Engels gave high praise to the literary work of Balzac, despite his truly vicious political position, is not this a guide to the *New Masses'* critics in estimating the literary work of a whole host of varied writers—Farrell, Richard Wright, someone else tomorrow? What is basic to all understanding is this: There is not always a commanding relationship between the way an artist votes and any particular work he writes. Sometimes there is, depending upon his choice of material and the degree to which he consciously advances political concepts in his work. (Koestler, for instance, always writes with a political purpose so organic to his work that it affects his rendering of character, theme, etc. He must be judged accordingly.) But there is no inevitable, consistent connection.

Furthermore, most writers of stature have given us great works in spite of philosophic weaknesses in their works. Doestoyevsky, Tolstoy, and Thomas Wolfe are among many examples. All too often narrow critics recognize this fact in dealing with dead writers, but are too inflexible to accept it in living writers. As a result it has been an accepted assumption in much of left-wing literary thought that a writer who repudiates a progressive political position—leaves the intellectual orbit of *New Masses*, let us say—must go down hill as a creative writer. But this is simply not true to sober fact, however true it may be in individual cases. Actually it is impossible to predict the literary future of Richard Wright at this moment. At this moment he takes political positions which seem to many to be fraught with danger for his own people. He may continue to do so. But *Black Boy*, whatever its shortcomings, is not the work of an artist who has gone down hill. It is to the credit of the *New Masses* that it recognized this in dealing with the book. Equally, it is impossible to predict now the future literary achievements or failure of James Farrell, of

Kenneth Fearing, of William Smith, as it is of Van Tillburg Clark, of Howard Fast, of Arnold Manoff, of Michael Blankfort. Books must be weighed like new coins—in terms of what they are. No other standard is valid. Writing is a complex process, and the sources of creative inspiration, out of which an artist works, are exceedingly complex. There are many, many reasons why writers grow and sometimes regress. The political convictions of a writer, or his lack of political convictions, may have something to do with his growth or creative decline, and certainly will if he writes highly politicalized novels (Koestler). But they don't always have to do with it (Marquand—Steinbeck), and any assumption that as a writer's politics do, so inevitably does his art go—forward or backward—is the assumption of naïveté.

I have discussed a number of the general evils which seem to me to flow from the vulgarization and one-sided application of the doctrine, "Art is a weapon." I'd like now to examine its specific effect upon creative writing.

A creative writer, accepting the esthetic standards I have described, almost inevitably begins to narrow his approach to the rich opportunities of his art. He works intellectually in an atmosphere in which the critics, the audience, the friends he respects, while revering art, actually judge works on the basis of their immediate political utility. It is, moreover, an urgent social atmosphere, one of constant political crises. Almost inevitably, the earnest writer, concerned about his fellow man, aware of the social crisis, begins to think of his work as only another form of leaflet writing. Perhaps he comes to no such conscious conclusions. But he does so in effect, and he begins to use his talent for an immediate political end. If the end is good, it would be absurd to say that this may not be socially useful. It would also be highly inaccurate to maintain that from an approach like this no art can result. On the other hand, I believe that the failure of much left-wing talent to mature is a comment on how restricting this canon is for the creator in practice.

The reason for this does not come primarily from the fact that works written for the moment are of interest only for the moment. Sometimes, as I pointed out earlier, they prove to have enduring interest also. It goes deeper—into the way a writer views his task, into the way he views people and events. The opportunity of the artist is conditioned by the nature of art itself. We read textbooks for facts, theories, information. But we read novels, or go to the theater, for a different purpose. The artist, by the nature of his craft, is able to show us people in motion. This is why we revere good writers. They let us observe the individual richly—a complex creature of manifold dreams, desires, disappointments—in his relation to other individuals and to his society.

The artist is most successful who most profoundly and accurately reveals his characters, with all their motivations clearly delineated.

But the writer who works to serve an immediate political purpose—whose desire it is to win friends for some political action or point of view—has set himself the task not primarily of revealing men and society as they are—the social novelist—but rather of winning a point—the political novelist. I am not saying that an artist should be without a point of view—does not inevitably guide his selection of materials, characters, etc.—or that any book, profoundly written, will be without political implications—the Brothers Karamazov. But there is a difference between possessing a philosophic point of view, which permeates one's work—the social novelist—and having a tactical ax to grind which usually requires the artificial manipulation of character and usually results in shallow writing—the political novelist or political propagandist working in the novel.

One can gain a useful lesson by examining "And Quiet Flows the Don." The central figure, Gregor, is a man who ends up as the political enemy of the Soviet revolution. I have always remembered a brilliant scene in the book: Gregor, who had fought with the Reds in the Civil War and then gone over to the Whites, returns to his village. He wants no more of fighting or politics. He asks only to live quietly as a farmer. But he is not allowed to remain at peace. Retribution, in the form of a Communist, catches up with him. The Communist comes to his house, listens to Gregor's earnest plea to be left alone and replies, with passion, "No, we will not leave you alone; we will hound you."

One cannot read this scene without sympathizing with Gregor and yearning for the Communist to be more tolerant. Yet—one understands both men. Their characters, history and motivations have been clearly presented. The position each takes is inevitable. The sympathetic insight into Gregor, the humanity of his presentation, does not, however, corrupt the historical point of view in the book. Rather, it deepens it.

The social illumination of this novel and its political meaning would not be possible with a different handling of Gregor. This is so because profound characterization presents all characters from their own point of view, allowing them their own full, human justification for their behavior and attitudes, yet allowing the reader to judge their objective behavior. This is the special wisdom art can offer us. But if Sholokhov had had a narrow political ax to grind, he would not have allowed Gregor his humanity, he would have wanted only to make the reader hate him, and so the breath of life would have gone from the book. It would have been weaker socially, psychologically, artistically, and politically.

The pitfall of the socially conscious writer who uses his art in a shallow manner is that his goal all too often subtly demands the annihilation of certain characters, the gilding of others. It is very, very difficult for him not to handle characters in black and white since his objective is to prove a proposition, not to reveal men in motion as they are.

Consequently, it is more than likely that he will "angle" character and events to achieve his point. He may not wish to do this. But he is led to it by his goal—led into idealistic conceptions of character, led into wearing rose-colored glasses which will permit him to see in life that which he wishes to find in order to prove his thesis, led into the portrayal of life, not as it is, but as he would like it to be. And this is not only inferior art, but shallow politics as well. He becomes the author of what Engels called "pinchpenny" socialist novels. This is why "the conflict of conscience," of which Schneider spoke, has resulted so often in schematic writing or wasted writing and, in not a few instances, in a book or a play which must be discharged when a change of newspaper headlines occurs.

This latter calamity is the very symbol of the pitfall dug for the artist by his own narrow approach to his art. I know of at least a dozen plays and novels discarded in the process of writing because the political scene altered. Obviously, the authors in question were not primarily bent upon portraying abiding truths, either of character or the social scene, but were mainly concerned with advancing a political tactic through the manipulation of character. Otherwise, a new headline in the newspapers would not have made them discard their work. I even know a historian who read Duclos and announced that he would have to revise completely the book he was engaged upon. But what type of history was this in the first place?

I am convinced that the work-in-progress of an artist who is deeply, truly, honestly recreating a sector of human experience need not be affected by a change in the political weather. A journalist's work, on the other hand, usually is affected. This is not an invidious judgment on the journalist. It is merely the difference between journalism and art. When the artist misuses his art, when he practices journalism instead of art, however decent his purposes, the result is neither the best journalism, nor the best art, nor the best politics.

The great humanistic tradition of culture has always been on the side of progress. The writer who works within this tradition—offering his personal contribution to it—is writing a political work in the broadest meaning of the term. It is not also incumbent upon him that he relate his broad philosophic or emotional humanism to a current and transient political tactic.

He may do so if he wishes. That is up to him. But if he does, he must remember that, where art is a weapon, it is only so when it is art. Those artists who work within a vulgarized approach to art do so at great peril to their own work and to the very purposes they seek to serve.

CHANGE THE WORLD

By Mike Gold

(Daily Worker, February 12, 1946)

Albert Maltz, who wrote some powerful political and proletarian novels in the past, seems about ready to repudiate that past, and to be preparing for a retreat into the stale old ivory tower of the art-for-art-sakers.

If you can extract any other message out of his piece in the current *New Masses*, you are a better mind reader than this columnist.

His thesis is the familiar one, viz: that much "wasted writing and bad art has," for the past 15 years, "been induced in American writers by the intellectual

atmosphere of the left wing" and that this bad influence has its central source in our vulgarized slogan: "Art is a weapon."

"It has been understood to mean that unless art is a weapon like a leaflet, serving immediate political ends, necessities, and programs, it is worthless or escapist or vicious," he says.

Another charge is we tend to judge works of art solely from the standpoint of the politics of the author.

"Writers must be judged by their work and not by the committees they join."

As an example of our "narrow and vulgar" tendency, Albert says: "The best case in point—although there are many—is James T. Farrell * * * one of the outstanding writers of America. I have not liked all of his work equally, and I don't like the committees he belongs to. But he wrote a superb trilogy and more than a few short stories of great quality, and he is not through writing, yet * * *."

There's a lot more of such theorizing, but I believe I have given a fair sample of the whole.

It has the familiar smell. I remember hearing all this sort of artistic moralizing before. The criticism of James T. Farrell, Max Eastman, Granville Hicks, and other renegades always attacked the same literary "sins of the Communists," and even quoted Lenin, Engels, and Marx to profusion.

One can refuse to answer Maltz on esthetic grounds, however. The fact remains that for 15 years, while Maltz was in the Communist literary movement, he managed to escape with his talents and get his novels written.

This Communist literary movement in the United States was the school that nurtured an Albert Maltz and gave him a philosophic basis. It gave him his only inspiration up to date. It also inspired and created a Richard Wright, who was born and reared in a humble John Reed club.

The best American writers of the past 15 years received their inspiration, their stock of ideas, from their contact, however brief or ungrateful, with the left-wing working class and this marxist philosophy.

* * * * *

Maltz's coy reference to the "political committees" on which James Farrell serves is a bad sign. Farrell is no mere little committee server, but a vicious, voluble Trotzkyite with many years of activity. Maltz knows that Farrell has long been a colleague of Max Eastman, Eugene Lyons, and similar rats who have been campaigning with endless lies and slanders for war on the Soviet Union.

It is a sign on Maltz's new personality that he hadn't the honesty to name Farrell's Trotzkyism for what it is; but to pass it off as a mere peccadillo. By such reasoning, Nazi rats like Ezra Pound and Knut Hansson, both superior writers to Farrell, must also be treated respectfully and even forgiven for their horrible politics because they are "artists."

There is a lot more one could say, and maybe I'll say it in a later column. Meanwhile, let me express my sorrow that Albert Maltz seems to have let the luxury and phony atmosphere of Hollywood at last to poison him.

It has to be constantly resisted or a writer loses his soul. Albert's soul was strong when it touched Mother Earth—the American working class. Now he is embracing abstractions that will lead him nowhere.

We are entering the greatest crisis of American history. The capitalists are plotting (and the big strikes are a first sample) to establish an American fascism as a prelude to an American conquest of the world.

Literary evasions of this reality can afford no inspiration to the young soldiers and trade-unionists, the Negroes, and all the rest of toiling humanity who must fight. The ivory tower may produce a little piece of art now and then, but it can never serve the writer who means to fight and destroy the Hitlers of this world.

MOVING FORWARD

By Albert Maltz

(The Worker, April 7, 1946)

We live in a period of social convulsion greater than the world has ever seen. Poverty, depression, colonial enslavement, racism, war, political conspiracy, mass murder—these are the problems with which humanity must deal. In this world of acute struggle, writers, like everyone else, live and work. Since the nature of their work is such that it is capable of influencing the thoughts, emo-

tions, and actions of others, it is right and good that the world should hold them responsible for what they write, and that they should hold themselves responsible.

I have believed this for quite some years now. I have also believed that in our time Marxism can be the bread of life to a serious writer. With these convictions, I published an article in the *New Masses* some weeks ago which was greeted by severe criticism. The sum total of this criticism was that my article was not a contribution to the development of the working cultural movement, but that its fundamental ideas, on the contrary, would lead to the paralysis and liquidation of left-wing culture.

Now these are serious charges, and were not rendered lightly, nor taken lightly by me. Indeed the seriousness of the discussion flows from the fact that my article was not published in the *Social Democratic New Leader* (which, to my humiliation, has since commented on it with wolfish approval), but that it was published in the *New Masses*.

In the face of these criticisms, I have been spending the intervening weeks in serious thought. I have had to ask myself a number of questions: Were the criticisms of my article sound? If so, by what process of thought had I, despite earnest intentions, come to write the article in the terms I did?

Intimately connected with these personal questions were broader matters demanding inquiry by others as well as by myself. If the criticisms of my article were sound, why was it that a number of friends who read the manuscript prior to publication and whose convictions are akin to mine had not come to such severe conclusions? And why was it that the *New Masses* accepted the article without comment to me, indeed with only a note of approval from the literary editor? And why was it that even after the criticisms of my article appeared, I daily received letters which protested the "ton" of the criticisms of me, but considered that at worst I only had fallen into a few "unfortunate" formulations?

I have come to quite a number of conclusions about these questions. And if I discuss the process of my arriving at them with some intimacy, I hope the reader will bear with me, since I know no other way of dealing honestly with the problem involved. I particularly invite those who have written me letters of approval to consider whether some of the remarks I have to make about myself may not be also appropriate to them.

II

I consider now that my article—by what I have come to agree was a one-sided, nondialectical treatment of complex issues—could not, as I had hoped, contribute to the development of left-wing criticism and creative writing. I believe also that my critics were entirely correct in insisting that certain fundamental ideas in my article would, if pursued to their conclusion, result in the dissolution of the left-wing cultural movement.

The discussion surrounding my article has made me aware of a trend in my own thinking, and in the thinking of at least some others in the left-wing cultural movement, namely, a tendency to abstract errors made by left critics from the total social scene, a tendency then to magnify those errors and to concentrate attention upon them without reference to a balanced view of the many related forces which bear upon left culture, and hence a tendency to advance from half-truths to total error.

Let me illustrate this point: In the thirties, as there seems to be general agreement, left-wing criticism was not always conducted on the deepest, or most desirable, or most useful level. Its effectiveness was lowered by tendencies toward doctrinaire judgments and toward a mechanical application of social criticism. And these tendencies must be understood and analyzed if working-class culture is to advance to full flower. But, on the other hand, the inadequacies of criticism, such as they were, are only a small and partial aspect of the left-wing cultural movement as a whole. The full truth—as I have been aware for many years, and as I was thoroughly aware even when writing my article, is this: From the left-wing cultural movement in America, and from the left wing internationally, has come the only major, healthy impetus to an honest literature and art that these last two decades have provided. Compound the errors of left cultural thought as high as you will—still its errors are small as compared to its useful contribution, are tiny as compared to the giant liberating and constructive force of Marxist ideas upon culture. As a matter of sheer fact this is such a self-evident proposition that it does not require someone of my conviction to state it; it has been acknowledged even by reactionary critics who, naturally, have then gone on falsely to declare that the liberating force of left culture has run its course and expired.

This total truth about the left wing is therefore the only proper foundation and matrix for a discussion of specific errors in the practice of social criticism and creative writing. It was in the omission of this total truth—in taking it for granted—in failing to record the host of writers who have been, and are now, nourished by the ideas and aspirations of the left wing—that I presented a distorted view of the facts, history and contribution of left-wing culture to American life. This was not my desire, but I accept it as the objective result. And, at the same time, by my one-sided zeal in attempting to correct errors, and so forth, I wrote an article that opened the way for the New Leader to seize upon my comments in order to “support” its unprincipled slanders against the left.

Of all that my article unwittingly achieved, this is the most difficult pill for me to swallow. My statements are now being offered up as fresh proof of the old lie: That the left puts artists in uniform. But it is a pill I have had to swallow and that I now want to dissolve.

Who and what keeps artists in uniform? In our society uniforms are indeed fitted for artists at every turn. But how? By a system of education which instructs a whole society in the belief that the status quo is unalterable, that social inequality is normal, that race prejudice is natural; by a social order which puts writing talent at the disposal of Hearst and artistic talent at the disposal of advertising agencies; by a total pressure made up of pressures and intellectual pressures and moral pressures, all designed to harness writers, artists, teachers, journalists, scientists, into willing or confused or frightened support of the established order in society, into maintaining, if need be, capitalist poverty, crime, prostitution, the cycle of wars and depressions—into maintaining all of this by their talent. This the way in which artists, unless they break loose in conscious and organized protest, are put into one of the many, elegantly cut uniforms offered them by our kings of monopoly, our lords of the press, radio, and so forth.

No; it is not the left wing that is guilty of this. On the contrary, the left wing, by its insistence that artists must be free to speak the absolute truth about society, by the intellectual equipment it offers in Marxist scientific thought, is precisely the force that can help the artist strip himself of the many uniforms into which he has been stepping since birth.

This is my conviction, and it has been my conviction for years. For precisely this reason it high lights the contradiction between my intentions in writing my article—and its result. By allowing a subjective concentration upon problems met in my own writing in the past to become a major preoccupation, I produced an article distinguished for its omissions, and succeeded in merging my comments with the unprincipled attacks upon the left that I have always repudiated and combated.

And this, as I said earlier, is the process by which one-sided thinking can lead to total error—it is the process by which objects, seen in a distortion mirror, can be recognized, but bear no relation to their precise features. It was this, among other things, that my critics pointed out sharply. For that criticism I am indebted. Ideas and opinions are worth holding when they are right, not when they are wrong. The effort to be useful involves always the possibility of being wrong; the right of being wrong, however, bears with it the moral obligation to analyze errors and to correct them. Anything else is irresponsible.

III

The second major criticism of the thinking in my article revolved about a separation between art and ideology, which was traced in varied terms, through a number of illustrations I had used and concepts I had advanced. I suppose I might claim here that it was merely inept formulation on my part which resulted in an “impression” that I was separating art from politics, the artist from the citizen, etc. But in the course of reading and rereading the criticisms of my article and the article itself, I have come to agree that I did make the separations mentioned, and that I made them not only in the writing, but in my thinking on the specific problems I was discussing.

Once again, this is the result of a one-sided, nondialectical approach. Out of a desire to find clear, creative paths for my own work and the work of others, I felt it necessary to combat the current of thought that, in the past, has tended to establish a mechanical relationship between ideology and art—a tendency that works particular harm to creative writing because it encourages a narrow, sloganized literature of a living reflection of society. However, in the course of

this "contribution," as has been pointed out, I severed the organic connection between art and ideology.

This is not a small matter, but a serious one. For if the progress of literature and art is separate from thought, if the ideas of a writer bear no intimate relationship to the work he produces, then even Fascists can produce good art. This is not only contrary to historic fact, but it is theoretically absurd. Good art has always, and will always, come from writers who love people, who ally themselves with the fate of the people, with the struggle of the people for social advancement. It is precisely because Fascists must hate people that 12 years of Nazi Germany produced not one piece of art in any field. It is for this reason that a writer like Céline, the Frenchman, who began with a talented work of protest, but who found no constructive philosophy for his protest, ended in corrupt cynicism, in hatred of people, in the artistic sterility of the Fascist. It is for the same reason that the talent of American writers like Farrell and Dos Passos has not matured but has, on the contrary, gone into swift down-grade into sheer dullness as well as the purveying of untruth.

Here I want to interrupt for a word of comment on Farrell. I agree now that my characterization of him was decidedly lax, and that it was the inadvertent, but inevitable, result of the line of thinking in my article that separated art from ideology and politics. I want to make clear, however, that while "a mild attitude toward Trotzkyites" was apparently the net effect upon readers of my comments, it was not at all what I had in mind, and it decidedly does not reflect my opinions. Actually if I had been attempting a thorough examination of Farrell, there would have been much more to say—and I want to say some of it now.

Farrell's history and work are the best example I know of the manner in which a poisoned ideology and an increasingly sick soul can sap the talent and wreck the living fiber of a man's work. This has been clear for quite some time now; his literary work has become weak, dull, repetitions. But precisely because this is so, and because his one outstanding work, *Studs Lonigan*, which ranks high among contemporary American novels—deservedly, I believe—was written before he became a Trotzkyite, it is essential to trace dialectically in his work—as in the work of others like him—the process of artistic decay. It was not something I was "cheering" about, but it is something to reckon with as sheer fact that Farrell, Wright, Dos Passos, Koestler, etc., are "not through writing yet," that they are going to produce other books. If no one in America read these authors, one could settle by ignoring them. But this is not the case; they are widely read. As I see it, the effective manner of dealing with their work is not to be content merely with contemptuous references; this will not satisfy those who, ignorant of their political roles, know only their novels.

What is needed is profound analysis of this method and logic by which their anti-Soviet, antipeople, antilabor attitudes enter their work, pervert their talents, turn them into tools and agents of reaction. Only in this manner can other writers be made to see clearly the artistic consequences of political corruption; only in this manner can the struggle for a mass audience be conducted in a truly persuasive and mature manner.

IV

At this point I should like to ask a question particularly of those who read my earlier article with approval, or with only sketchy criticism: What is the sum of what I have been saying up until now?

It seems clear to me, as I hope it is already clear to them, that I have been discussing and illustrating revisionism, and that my article, as pointed out by others, was a specific example of revisionist thinking in the cultural field.

For what is revisionism? It is distorted Marxism, turning half-truths into total untruths, splitting ideology from its class base, denying the existence of class struggles in society, converting Marxism from a science of society and struggle into apologetics for monopoly exploitation. In terms of my article I think the clearest summation was given by Samuel Sillen in the *Daily Worker*:

"A hasty reading of the article may give the impression that it merely offers suggestions for correcting admitted defects of the literary left. But a deeper study of the article reveals that these suggestions, some of which might be valuable in another context, are here bound up with a line of thinking that would lead us to shatter the very foundation of the literary left, Marxism. This is the main issue. On this issue we must have utmost clarity.

"While Maltz seems to believe that he is merely criticizing a 'vulgarized approach' to literature, he is in reality undermining a class approach. While

appearing to challenge an over-simplified identity between art and politics, he severs their organic relationship in our epoch. In repudiating the 'accepted understanding' of art as a weapon, Maltz whittles down the concept itself to a point approaching nonexistence. In centering his fire on the 'literary atmosphere of the left,' he ignores the basic problem of an honest writer in capitalist society, the 'literary atmosphere of the right.'

"The article cannot be viewed simply as a challenge to mechanical application of fundamental truths. The truths themselves are crushed under the structure of Maltz's reasoning. * * * What is the main problem of the literary left today? It is to reestablish its Marxist base. In the past few years that base has been sapped by revisionism."

I believe that Sillen's summation is correct. The process he describes here is a revisionist process; it is the result of a failure to deeply break with old habits of thought. This failure was, I believe, at the core of the main tendencies in my article and it was the key to its uncritical acceptance by more than a few in the cultural field, both before and after publication. The intense, ardent, and sharp discussion around my article, therefore, seems to me have been a healthy and necessary one—and to have laid the foundation whereby a new clarity can be achieved, a new consciousness forged, and a struggle undertaken to return, deeply, to sound Marxist principles. For it is essential that everyone, who appreciates that a healthy culture must be based on the needs of the people and the needs of the working class, appreciate also that Browderism could not lead to such a culture. A literature that would be uncritical of monopoly capital and its effect upon human lives, indeed a literature based on the concept that monopoly capital can serve the American people progressively—such a literature would be wholly out of step with life. It could not represent the facts of life. Creative writers who approached life with this philosophy would have to avoid realistic, honest writing. However much they might feel ardent sympathy for the people, they would be forced into the position of ignoring reality—and hence their actual work would finally become indistinguishable from the empty literature to be found in the popular magazines.

This, with all of its implications, is the reason why a serious and sharp discussion was required of the ideas developed in my article.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. McGuinness, Mr. Nixon developed a very good point there. My thought is this: Ninety-nine and nine-tenths percent of the customers of the industry go to the movies to be entertained. They don't go to learn something particularly. They go to be entertained. The term has been used here a number of times by various folks, both on and off the committee, "making anti-Communist pictures." I think that is a poor term. I think I am on solid ground in saying that the committee isn't urging you to make any kind of pictures, that that is a matter for the motion-picture producers to determine. Our thought in the matter would be that your writers confine themselves when they delve into political matters and historical matters to the truth, and not to make anything anti or pro. I believe the American public would appreciate that, too.

Would you agree that that should be the situation?

Mr. MCGUINNESS. Mr. McDowell, if you will permit me, I believe that the screen has prospered by being basically a form of entertainment. I believe that the screen is an awkward medium for political debate, for this reason: The presentation of any one political viewpoint on the screen and its appearance, setting a date for that, would require at least 18 months—to find the story, to have it written, to have a test, acted on, cut, scored, previewed, and then manufactured and distributed. Eighteen months would be a minimum, before anybody could enter a rebuttal.

I am opposed to any form of censorship of the screen. I think the screen should be free to say anything it wants to say. But I think what it says should be labeled openly for what it is. If it is a political

picture and it expresses one viewpoint, I think the screen has an obligation to present the other. Personally, I would rather that we confined ourselves to drama and entertainment.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, that is a first-class answer. It appears to me that the motion-picture industry has been doing that, that your fight has largely been to keep doing it, and I hope you continue keep doing it.

Mr. McGUINNESS. We will.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. Mr. McGuinness, you probably are aware of the fact that this committee has had before it several resolutions presented by various Congressmen providing for legislation to outlaw communism. What is your feeling with respect to such legislation?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think that the outlawing of a political belief serves no purpose. I don't think a law ever overcomes an idea. But I do believe that if the Communist Party can be demonstrated on sufficient evidence to the Congress to be the agent of a foreign power, then it is obligatory to defend the sovereignty and the freedoms of the United States by recognizing it as such and outlawing it for that reason.

Mr. VAIL. Well, in various hearings before this committee the opinion has been advanced by such authorities as J. Edgar Hoover that the Communist Party is very definitely an agent of the Soviet Government. If it was definitely established that that was a fact, then it would be your feeling that the enactment of such legislation would be in order?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I think it would be vital. I am all in favor of it.

Mr. VAIL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, do you have any questions?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. Mr. McGuinness, in connection with the suppression of films, could you tell the committee whether or not a few years ago the Communists conducted a campaign to keep a picture on the life of Eddie Rickenbacker from being produced?

Mr. McGUINNESS. I believe that an effort was made at that time to keep that picture from being made. It was, however, unsuccessful.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. McGuinness. You have been a very splendid witness.²⁵

Mr. McGUINNESS. Thank you, Mr. Thomas.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the Chair would like to announce to the members of the committee that, after we recess today, we will immediately go down to our own chambers on the second floor and go into executive session. The Chair would also like to announce that the first witness this afternoon at 2 o'clock will be Mr. Robert Taylor. We will stand in recess.

(Whereupon, at 11:55 a. m., a recess was taken in the hearing.)

AFTER RECESS

The hearing was resumed at 2 p. m., pursuant to the taking of the recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed with the next witness I would like to place into the record a telegram which was

²⁵ See appendix, p. 529, for exhibit 37.

received this noon from Mr. Sam Wood, who was a witness before the committee on Monday.

You will recall that Mr. Wood testified that he considered four directors to be Communists. He could not recall the name of the fourth one.

I have the following telegram from Mr. Wood: ²⁶

It is signed "Sam Wood."

The CHAIRMAN. Is that all you have, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor, will you please raise your right hand? Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT TAYLOR

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, will you state your full name and present address for the record, please?

Mr. TAYLOR. My full name is Robert Taylor. My present address is 807 North Rodeo Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask all these still photographers to stay there for a few more minutes, take a few shots, then come down here and take your positions. We do not want to have any confusion in the chambers. Moving around brings about some confusion.

Mr. Taylor, would you please speak a little louder?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Please state when and where you were born, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was born in Filley, Nebr., August 5, 1911.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are here before the Committee on Un-American Activities in response to a subpoena which was served upon you on October 3, 1947, are you not?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the subpoena be made a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.²⁷

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation, Mr. Taylor?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am presently employed as an actor by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios in Culver City, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been an actor?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been employed as an actor since 1934.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. TAYLOR. I have been in Hollywood since 1933.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you in the last World War?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. In what branch of the service?

Mr. TAYLOR. The United States Naval Air Service.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was your rank?

Mr. TAYLOR. I was discharged from the Navy as a full lieutenant.

²⁶ See appendix, p. 529, for exhibit 38.

²⁷ See appendix, p. 530, for exhibit 39.

Mr. STRIPLING. During the time you have been in Hollywood has there been any period during which you considered that the Communist Party or the fellow travelers of the Communist Party were exerting any influence in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, of course, I have been looking for communism for a long time. I have been so strongly opposed to it for so many years; I think in the past 4 or 5 years, specifically, I have seen more indications which seemed to me to be signs of communistic activity in Hollywood and the motion-picture industry.

Mr. STRIPLING. In any particular field?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir. I suppose the most readily determined field in which it could be cited would be in the preparation of scripts—specifically, in the writing of those scripts. I have seen things from time to time which appeared to me to be slightly on the pink side, shall we say; at least, that was my personal opinion.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could we have a little better order?

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Please come to order.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, in referring to the writers, do you mean writers who are members of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. TAYLOR. I assume that they are writers of the Screen Writers Guild. There seem to be many different factions in skills in Hollywood. I don't know just who belongs to what sometimes, but I assume they are members of the guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of any guild?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am a member of the Screen Actors Guild; yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever noticed any elements within the Screen Actors Guild that you would consider to be following the Communist Party line?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, yes, sir; I must confess that I have. I am a member of the board of directors of the Screen Actors Guild. Quite recently I have been very active as a director of that board. It seems to me that at meetings, especially meetings of the general membership of the guild, there is always a certain group of actors and actresses whose every action would indicate to me that if they are not Communists they are working awfully hard to be Communists. I don't know. Their tactics and their philosophies seem to me to be pretty much party-line stuff.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt for just a minute? We are going to recess for about 2 minutes and we hope everybody will keep their seats.

(A short recess was taken.)

The CHAIRMAN. All right, we will go in session again. Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, these people in the Screen Actors Guild who, in your opinion follow the Communist Party line, are they a disrupting influence within the organization?

Mr. TAYLOR. It seems so to me. In the meetings which I have attended, at least on issues in which apparently there is considerable unanimity of opinion, it always occurs that someone is not quite able to understand what the issue is and the meeting, instead of being over at 10 o'clock or 10:30 when it logically should be over, probably winds up running until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning on such issues as points of order, and so on.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall the names of any of the actors in the guild who participated in such activity?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, yes, sir; I can name a few who seem to sort of disrupt things once in awhile. Whether or not they are Communists, I don't know.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you name them for the committee, please?

Mr. TAYLOR. One chap we have currently, I think, is Mr. Howard Da Silva. He always seems to have something to say at the wrong time. Miss Karen Morley also usually appears at the guild meetings.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is K-a-r-e-n M-o-r-l-e-y?

Mr. TAYLOR. I believe so; yes, sir. Those are two I can think of right at the moment.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, have you ever participated in any picture as an actor which you considered contained Communist propaganda?

Mr. TAYLOR. I assume we are now referring to *Song of Russia*. I must confess that I objected strenuously to doing *Song of Russia* at the time it was made. I felt that it, to my way of thinking at least, did contain Communist propaganda. However, that was my personal opinion. A lot of my friends and people whose opinions I respect did not agree with me.

When the script was first given me I felt it definitely contained Communist propaganda and objected to it upon that basis. I was assured by the studio that if there was Communist propaganda in that script it would be eliminated. I must admit that a great deal of the things to which I objected were eliminated.

Another thing which determined my attitude toward *Song of Russia* was the fact that I had recently been commissioned in the Navy and was awaiting orders. I wanted to go ahead and get in the Navy. However, it seems at the time there were many pictures being made to more or less strengthen the feeling of the American people toward Russia.

I did *Song of Russia*. I don't think it should have been made. I don't think it would be made today.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, in connection with the production of *Song of Russia*, do you know whether or not it was made at the suggestion of a representative of the Government?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not believe that it was made at the suggestion of a Government representative; no, sir. I think the script was written and prepared long before any representative of the Government became involved in it in any way.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you ever present at any meeting at which a representative of the Government was present and this picture was discussed?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir; in Mr. L. B. Mayer's office. One day I was called to meet Mr. Mellett whom I met in the company of Mr. Mayer and, as I recall, the *Song of Russia* was discussed briefly. I don't think we were together more than 5 minutes.

It was disclosed at that time that the Government was interested in the picture being made and also pictures of that nature being made by other studios as well. As I say, it was to strengthen the feeling of the American people toward the Russian people at that time.

Mr. STRIPLING. The Mellett you referred to is Mr. Lowell Mellett?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. He was the Chief of the Bureau of Motion Pictures of the Office of War Information?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is right. However, may I clarify something?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes; go right ahead.

Mr. TAYLOR. If I ever gave the impression in anything that appeared previously that I was forced into making *Song of Russia*, I would like to say in my own defense, lest I look a little silly by saying I was ever forced to do the picture, I was not forced because nobody can force you to make any picture.

I objected to it but in deference to the situation as it then existed I did the picture.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you have any special qualification, Mr. Taylor, for the particular part they wanted to fill? I understand you were selected, among other reasons, because of the fact that you were a musician.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I assume that that might have been a qualification for doing a part in *Song of Russia*. Yes, I had studied music quite extensively in college and previous to going to college.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you tell the committee whether or not in your experience in Hollywood any scripts have ever been submitted to you which contained any lines of material which you considered might be un-American or communistic—any lines which you objected to?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes, sir. I think from time to time you are bound to run into lines and situations and scenes which I would consider objectionable. One script was submitted to me quite some time ago, but not officially from the studio, which I objected to on the basis that it seemed to foster ideologies which I did not personally agree with.

However, nothing more came out of it. The script has not been made and I have heard nothing more about it, as a matter of fact.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, there has been quite some testimony here regarding the presence within the motion-picture industry of a number of writers who are considered to be Communists. Are you personally acquainted with any of the writers whom you consider to be Communists or who follow the Communist Party line?

Mr. TAYLOR. I know several writers—I know of several writers in the motion-picture business who are reputedly fellow travelers or possibly Communists. I don't know about that.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have no personal knowledge of it yourself?

Mr. TAYLOR. I know one gentleman employed at the studio at which I am employed, Mr. Lester Cole, who is reputedly a Communist. I would not know personally.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you say that after Pearl Harbor the activities of the Communists in the motion-picture industry increased or decreased?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think quite obviously it must have increased. The ground for their work in this country was obviously more fertile. I would say "yes"; it did definitely increase following Pearl Harbor.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, have you ever joined any Communist-front organization?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, sir; believe me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever played in any picture with people whom you had any doubts about as to their loyalty to the Government?

Mr. TAYLOR. Not that I know of. I have never worked with anyone knowingly who is a Communist. Moreover, I shall never work with anyone who is a Communist.

Mr. STRIPLING. You would refuse to act in a picture in which a person whom you considered to be a Communist was also cast; is that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. I most assuredly would and I would not even have to know that he was a Communist. This may sound biased; however, if I were even suspicious of a person being a Communist with whom I was scheduled to work, I am afraid it would have to be him or me, because life is a little too short to be around people who annoy me as much as these fellow travelers and Communists do.

Mr. STRIPLING. You definitely consider them to be a bad influence upon the industry?

Mr. TAYLOR. I certainly do; yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. They are a rotten apple in the barrel?

Mr. TAYLOR. To me they are and I further believe that 99.9 percent of the people in the motion-picture industry feel exactly as I do.

Mr. STRIPLING. What do you think would be the best way to approach the problem of ridding the industry of the Communists who are now entrenched therein?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, sir, if I were given the responsibility of getting rid of them I would love nothing better than to fire every last one of them and never let them work in a studio or in Hollywood again. However, that is not my position.

If I were producing a picture on my own—and I hope I never do—but if I were, I would not have one of them within 100 miles of me or the studio or the script. I am sure the producers in Hollywood are faced with a slightly different problem. They are heads of an industry and as heads of an industry they might be slightly more judicial than I, as an individual, would be.

I believe firmly that the producers, the heads of the studios in Hollywood, would be and are more than willing to do everything they can to rid Hollywood of Communists and fellow travelers.

I think if given the tools with which to work—specifically, some sort of national legislation or an attitude on the part of the Government as such which would provide them with the weapons for getting rid of these people—I have no doubt personally but what they would be gone in very short order.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, do you consider that the motion picture primarily is a vehicle of entertainment and not of propaganda?

Mr. TAYLOR. I certainly do. I think it is the primary job of the motion-picture industry to entertain; nothing more, nothing less.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think the industry would be in a better position if it stuck strictly to entertainment without permitting political films to be made, without being so labeled?

Mr. TAYLOR. I certainly do. Moreover, I feel that largely the picture business does stick to entertainment. I do not think they let themselves be sidetracked too much with propaganda films and things of that sort. Every once in a while things do sneak in that nobody catches. If the Communists are not working in the picture business there is no motive for their sneaking things in.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Taylor, returning to the picture *Song of Russia* for a moment, Miss Ayn Rand gave the committee a review of the

picture several days ago. In the picture there were several scenes, particularly a wedding scene at which a priest officiated; also several other scenes at which the clergy was present. When you were making this picture were you under the impression that freedom of religion was enjoyed in Russia?

MR. TAYLOR. No, sir; I never was under the impression that freedom of religion was enjoyed in Russia. However, I must confess when it got down to that part of the picture the picture was about two-thirds gone and it didn't actually occur to me until you mentioned it just a minute ago.

MR. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have now, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

MR. NIXON. No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

MR. VAIL. No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

MR. McDOWELL. Mr. Taylor, you have been interested in this matter for quite a long time, and probably know as much about the situation in Hollywood as any person who lives there. There have been many statements made since Mr. Thomas and I were to Hollywood last May and began this investigation into the Communist activities on the west coast, to the effect that the Committee on Un-American Activities was attempting to control thought or frighten the producers out there into producing some sort of picture. Has that been your impression of our activities?

MR. TAYLOR. No, sir; not at any time did I get that impression.

MR. McDOWELL. I am very glad to hear you say that. I thought a great deal about things I have read in various columns of the papers as to our attempting to control the great American movie industry. It is silly. The Committee on Un-American Activities is attempting to find the enemies of the Nation. We are not concerned with liberals or conservatives or anything of that kind; we are hunting enemies of the Nation. We know some are in Hollywood. Thank you for coming.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

MR. NIXON. Mr. Taylor, as a result of your appearance before the Subcommittee on Un-American Activities in Hollywood a few months ago, you were subject to considerable criticism and ridicule from certain left-wing quarters were you not?

MR. TAYLOR. I am afraid so; yes, sir. It didn't bother me, however.

MR. NIXON. And as the result of your testimony and your appearance before this committee today and the stand you have taken on this issue you will be the subject of additional ridicule and criticism from those quarters; will you not?

MR. TAYLOR. I suppose so. However, any time any of the left-wing press or individuals belonging to the left wing or their fellow-traveler groups ridicule me, I take it as a compliment because I really enjoy their displeasure.

MR. NIXON. You realize, however, that your success as an actor, your livelihood as an actor, depends to a great extent upon the type of publicity you receive?

MR. TAYLOR. Yes, sir.

MR. NIXON. And that ridicule and abuse heaped upon you has a much more serious effect than it would have upon a person who does

not depend upon public acceptance of what he does? Yet you feel that under the circumstances it is your duty as an American citizen to state your views on this matter?

Mr. TAYLOR. I most assuredly do, sir.

Mr. NIXON. As far as you are concerned, even though it might mean that you would suffer possibly at the box office, possibly in reputation or in other ways for you to appear before this committee, you feel you are justified in making the appearance and you would do so again if you were requested to do so?

Mr. TAYLOR. I certainly would, sir. I happen to believe strongly enough in the American people and in what the American people believe in to think that they will go along with anybody who prefers America and the American form of government over any other subversive ideologies which might be presented and by whom I might be criticized. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor, are you in favor of the motion-picture industry making anti-Communist pictures giving the facts about communism?

Mr. TAYLOR. Congressman Thomas, when the time arrives—and it might not be long—when pictures of that type are indicated as necessary, I believe the motion-picture industry will and should make anti-Communist pictures. When that time is going to be I don't happen to know, but I believe they should and will be made.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any other questions, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like to ask Mr. Taylor if he thinks the Communist Party should be outlawed, for this reason: This committee presently has before it two bills which seek to do that very thing, legislation which would in fact outlaw the party. Do you think that would reach this Communist influence in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, in order to answer that, I personally, with all due regard to Mr. Hoover, whose opinion I respect most highly, certainly do believe that the Communist Party should be outlawed. However, I am not an expert on politics or on what the reaction would be. If I had my way about it they would all be sent back to Russia or some other unpleasant place [loud applause] and never allowed back in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. I am going to ask the audience to please not applaud. We are trying to get the facts here. This is not a show, or anything like that. Do not applaud any of the witnesses who are on the stand, or at any other time. Go ahead, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. If outlawing the Communist Party would solve the Communist threat in this country then I am thoroughly in approval and accord with it being outlawed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other member have any questions?
(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor, thank you very much for coming here today. We want to congratulate you for your very frank statement.

We are going to ask all the audience and all the photographers to please keep your seats while the witness is leaving. We will have another witness in a few seconds. Mr. Leckie and Mr. Smith, please escort the witness from the chambers.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Stripling, call your next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Howard Rushmore.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will recess for 1 minute.

(A short recess was taken.)

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Mr. Rushmore.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

Mr. Stripling.

TESTIMONY OF HOWARD RUSHMORE

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Rushmore, please state your full name.

Mr. RUSHMORE. Howard Rushmore.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present address?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Huntington, Long Island, N. Y.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Mitchell, S. Dak., 1912.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are here in response to a subpoena, are you not?²⁸

Mr. RUSHMORE. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Editorial department of the New York Journal-American.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been employed there?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Seven years.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. During what period?

Mr. RUSHMORE. From 1936 to 1939.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you ever hold any position in the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you enumerate to the committee the positions you held in the party?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Chiefly film critic for the Daily Worker. I was also on the Daily Worker as managing editor of their Sunday magazine, as city editor on Sunday, and had a few jobs like that, but chiefly as film critic.

Mr. STRIPLING. Why did you break with the party?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Largely over the review of *Gone With the Wind*, which I criticized for its defects, calling it a magnificent bore, but parts here and there I thought praiseworthy. For a period of a year the party had been insisting movies be handled in a much more tough fashion, shall I say, and I thought that to ask for a boycott of *Gone With the Wind* was a little strong. There developed quite an argument over that and I resigned and left the party December 27, 1939.

Mr. STRIPLING. As one who was in the party and who would be familiar with the party's position regarding movies, will you state to the committee the attitude of the Communist International, which is the governing body, shall we say, of the Communist Party, regarding the motion-picture industry or the movies?

²⁸ See appendix, p. 530, for exhibit 40.

Mr. RUSHMORE. I will go back to 1925. The Daily Worker published an article by Willie Muenzenburg. Mr. Muenzenburg was a member of the Communist International and in charge of C. I. cultural affairs and in the Daily Worker of 1925 he wrote the following—

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Rushmore, are you referring to C. I.—

Mr. RUSHMORE. Communist International. That is the usual party term for the Communist International.

Muenzenburg wrote as follows:

We must develop the tremendous cultural possibilities in a revolutionary sense. One of the most pressing tasks confronting the Communist Party in the field of propaganda is the conquest of this supremely important propaganda until now the monopoly of the ruling class. We must wrest it from them and turn it against them.

This article dealt entirely with the movie industry.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have any information or quotations which reflect the position of Lenin?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Well, Lenin, as leader of the Russian Revolution, wrote the following:

Communists must always consider that of all the arts the motion picture is the most important.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you tell us whether or not this line as laid down by Muenzenburg has been followed in the United States?

Mr. RUSHMORE. It has been followed very carefully since 1925. At first the Communist Party sought to set up independent production units, one of which was called the Film and Photo League, later another one called Frontier Films, to produce documentary pictures of communist agitation and propaganda. However, as that went along they saw they couldn't reach what they called the masses with such 16-millimeter films and their lack of distributive methods.

I might cite one of these films which—two of them, as a matter of fact—put out by Frontier Films, which was organized largely by Herbert Kline, who is a member of the Communist Party. This movie, the Heart of Spain, was widely shown in Hollywood, and one labor film, which was Our Civil Liberties, which was praised by Donald Ogden Stewart in the Daily Worker and called a magnificent film.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, you referred to Herbert Kline as a party member. How do you know he is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I have seen him at national headquarters of the Communist Party, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York, in a part of the building where only party members were admitted.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did the Communists organize any other movie groups?

Mr. RUSHMORE. They had what they called Film Audiences for Democracy and set up branches of that throughout the United States and had a very active branch in Hollywood. A lot of prominent people, some of them certainly not Communists, were drawn into this innocent sounding Communist front organization. I noticed in the Daily Worker that Walter Wanger, the producer, spoke before the Hollywood branch of the Film Audiences for Democracy, and he is quoted in the Daily Worker of April 14, 1939, defending the

movie, Blockade, which, incidentally, the Communist Party supported fully, Wanger said of Blockade:

Every film that was ever made was propaganda for something, there is no such thing as a film which does not contain propaganda.

I might add that that Wanger picture, Blockade, gave 100 percent endorsement of Stalin's effort to seize Spain as another foreign colony of the Kremlin, and the Communist Party through all its fronts and CIO and A. F. of L. unions which it controlled, put on a terrific campaign for Blockade.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you tell the committee the purposes of the organization of Film Audiences for Democracy, what was it, why was it established?

Mr. RUSHMORE. It was set up—there are several reasons. One, as a pressure group, which I will explain later, and also as a, shall we call it, public relations outfit, to get across to the public the kind of movie the Communists thought the public should see.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was the mechanical set-up as to the Communists directly in Hollywood? In other words, how was their activity directed in the motion picture industry?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Well, at the time I was on the Daily Worker for those 3 years John Howard Lawson was in direct charge of Communist activities in Hollywood.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like to ask you, you referred to Film Audiences of Democracy as a pressure group, do you mean that they organized picket lines against certain pictures which they felt were, for one reason or another, unfavorable to their position?

Mr. RUSHMORE. They did that to a great extent. Also they organized a very skillful form of propaganda. Say the Communist Party had been informed that a movie was coming out within a couple of months which was anti-Communist or anti-some part of their particular line or foreign policy. Film Audiences for Democracy would line up the various unions in the Communist periphery, the innumerable front organizations, and carry on a letter and telegram campaign to the producers. They would get church groups, they would get almost any kind of organization to wire these protests. As a result the producers would have thousands of letters and telegrams coming in demanding this picture be halted.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not the Communists got tips direct from Hollywood as to what would be produced? In other words, that they might organize in advance a campaign against either the production of the picture or its showing at theaters?

Mr. RUSHMORE. They received regular information on the kind of pictures coming out from the various studios and in some cases I know that the actual script, or a copy of it, rather, was sent to the Cultural Commission of the party at 35 East Twelfth Street months before the picture went into production.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was the name of that picture?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Well, let me check my notes here. There were several of them.

One movie that I remember particularly was Our Leading Citizen, put out by Paramount, and the script of Our Leading Citizen was sent to V. J. Jerome, who was the head of the Communist Party Cultural

Commission, and I was told by the Cultural Commission that they had looked over this script and decided that this movie was one of the most anti-Communist movies in years, and that they were going to line up a boycott of it. I reviewed the movie—that was in 1939—I reviewed the movie and we called for a boycott of the picture. The next day the party had already prepared around three columns of protests from so-called progressive labor leaders, community leaders, and people like that. The letter and telegram barrage against Paramount started immediately but the entire campaign was planned to begin on the opening day of the picture on Broadway.

Mr. STRIPLING. In these boycotts does the Communist Party mobilize a united front of its various front organizations or is it strictly the activity of the party itself?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Oh, they use every organization that they control or have influence in, not only their major organizations, the CIO and the A. F. of L., but the Council of American-Soviet Friendship, the old-time American League for Peace and Democracy, the American Youth for Democracy, they have factions in such church organizations as Epworth League, they have a faction of ministers under Communist control who can be depended on.

Mr. STRIPLING. A faction of ministers?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Yes. The word "faction" means a group who work within a large organization.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you identify the group?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I never met with them. Clarence Hathaway, editor of the Daily Worker at the time I was there, was in charge of these ministers. Clarence used to tell me how he got a big kick out of meeting twice a week, as he said with a bunch of preachers and giving them the party line, which they carried out through various front organizations set up, and individually, and perhaps in their churches.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Rushmore, there has been testimony before the committee given yesterday by Mr. Rupert Hughes to the effect that certain producers in Hollywood refrained from producing anti-Communist films because they were forewarned that if they did so-called stinkpots would be placed in theaters and the upholstery in the seats would be slashed. As a former Communist and one who was in the inner circle of the party do you think that the Communist Party would resort to such tactics or do you know whether they ever have?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Not of my own knowledge but it is very possible that they would do that. I have been at union meetings when they discussed the breaking of windows or the breaking of skulls, so the use of stinkpots in a movie is quite possible.

Mr. STRIPLING. Who was the commissar of the motion-picture industry when you were in the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSHMORE. At the time I was there the person in charge of party activities in Hollywood was John Howard Lawson.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, John Howard Lawson is a writer—

Mr. RUSHMORE. He is a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. And one of those who has been subpoenaed before the committee.

Did you ever meet John Howard Lawson?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where did you meet him?

Mr. RUSHMORE. The date would be late 1937 or early 1938, on the ninth floor of the Communist Party headquarters, 35 East Twelfth Street.

Mr. STRIPLING. The ninth floor. Is there any particular significance to the ninth floor?

Mr. RUSHMORE. That is the inner sanctum, the place where the national officers of the Community Party have their headquarters.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you consider John Howard Lawson to be a member of the Communist Party or did you consider him to be one at that time?

Mr. RUSHMORE. At this particular meeting I was invited by Clarence Hathaway, the editor of the Daily Worker, to attend. It was a meeting of the cultural commission of the Communist Party.

Mr. STRIPLING. May I interrupt? Would you explain to the committee, briefly, just what is the cultural commission of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSHMORE. It is a sort of subcommittee of the central committee. The central committee is the governing body of the Communist Party. This subcommittee is one of its most important adjuncts. It was organized by Alexander Trachtenburg, who is a member of the political bureau of the Communist Party. This cultural commission was set up by Trachtenburg after his return from one of his many trips to Moscow, I think around in 1934, and furthermore Trachtenburg himself told me at one time that the regular reports of the commission's activities were delivered to Moscow either by himself or a courier at least once a year.

Mr. STRIPLING. Who was in charge of the commission, the cultural commission?

Mr. RUSHMORE. V. J. Jerome.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is his real name?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Isaac Romaine.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not he was ever in Hollywood?

Mr. RUSHMORE. He has made many trips to Hollywood.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know why he went there?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Well, Jerome went there to—I will cite one instance that I know of—to make a speech before the Anti-Nazi League in Hollywood, which was largely under party control.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League?

Mr. RUSHMORE. That is right. I might add Jerome is one of the most important leaders of the Communist Party. To prove that, he was editor for years for the Communist magazine. That is their most important publication. It is the theoretical organ of the Communist Party. Jerome's job was seeing that this magazine reflected the policy as laid down by Moscow to the American Communists.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether V. J. Jerome ever collaborated with Hanns Eisler, either in Eisler's articles or in songs which Hanns Eisler wrote the music for?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I have a recollection of that, but it is only a vague one. I know that Eisler, as one of the bosses of the American Communist Party, would have jurisdiction over Jerome. That would be self-evident.

Mr. STRIPLING. In other words, Gerhart Eisler was Jerome's boss?

Mr. RUSHMORE. He would be one of them.

Mr. STRIPLING. One of them?

Mr. RUSHMORE. One of the major ones.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you consider Gerhart Eisler to be a representative of the Communist International in the United States?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I never met him. At that time he was pretty much under wraps and in the Communist Party the rank and file newspaperman never meets what they call the C. I. reps, the Communist International representatives.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not Jerome ever went to Hollywood for the purpose of collecting funds for the party's activities?

Mr. RUSHMORE. That I don't know. I do know that in this meeting which Jerome was chairman of, he and Lawson talked at great length about the party's fund raising in Hollywood. It was my observation at this meeting that it was Lawson's job to raise money in Hollywood, to have a certain quota, and whether it was weekly or monthly I don't know, but there was considerable discussion on Lawson's part about this quota, and Jerome expressed dissatisfaction with the amount being raised, although when Lawson said how much it was it rather astonished me, it was up in the high figures.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Rushmore, a few moments ago when I asked you concerning Communists' exploitation of front groups you mentioned the A. F. of L. Do you mean to say that the A. F. of L. is a front for the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I think I said the controlled unions. I mean by that the unions in the A. F. of L. controlled by the Communist Party.

Mr. STRIPLING. However, there are very few?

Mr. RUSHMORE. There are very few.

Mr. STRIPLING. You didn't mean to infer the A. F. of L. generally?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Oh, no.

Mr. STRIPLING. You didn't mean to infer the CIO generally? stands on communism.

Mr. RUSHMORE. No, sir. The A. F. of L. recently, at its convention, as did, I think, the CIO, put itself, happily, on record as to where it

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you ever attend a meeting at which John Howard Lawson and Clarence Hathaway were present?

Mr. RUSHMORE. That was the meeting I spoke of, in late 1937 or early 1938, at which Hathaway was present, Lawson, Jerome, as chairman, Bob Reed, who was the commissar in Actors Equity, an organization on Broadway, and two or three others whose names I have forgotten.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall what Lawson said at this meeting?

Mr. RUSHMORE. He spoke of a number of things. In fact, he made a complaint, I remember, in which he said, you comrades feel that we can get anything into a script that we want to. He said, there are a lot of Fascists out in Hollywood and, he said, we have trouble with them, and often stuff we do get in is cut out, and many times we don't think it is safe to try.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did he say anything about the recruiting of new writers to be sent to Hollywood?

Mr. RUSHMORE. He asked Jerome and spoke to the cultural commission and said that any new writers, any novelists, who had something

published, that had had fairly good reviews, and who were either party members or could be handled by the party, should be sent to Hollywood and room could be made for them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did he discuss the amount of money that had been raised in Hollywood for Communist Party purposes?

Mr. RUSHMORE. At this particular meeting they were talking about a quota; the exact amount I don't remember, but when Lawson gave the amount he had raised that quota, it was up in the thousands. I was impressed because at that time the Daily Worker salaries were \$20 a week—when we got it—and this sounded like big money to me.

Mr. McDOWELL. You say "when you got it." Didn't you always get it?

Mr. RUSHMORE. No.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were just "in the movement," is that right, Mr. Rushmore?

Mr. RUSHMORE. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Mr. Lawson discuss any movies in his talk at this meeting at the Communist Party headquarters?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I don't remember the name of any particular movie. He did say that the party in Hollywood had been successful in getting producers to plan some films supporting Loyalist Spain.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee what the party line was regarding the personalities in the movies? In other words, were some movie stars plugged and others panned?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Why, the general party line, as I heard it from my discussions with Jerome in his office over a period of 3 years, at this meeting with Lawson, who came direct from Hollywood, and other people involved in Hollywood activity in the party, the general line would be that stars are, 99 percent of them, political morons, and they added other uncomplimentary things, which I wouldn't care to repeat, but the Communist Party per se had great contempt for the movie stars of Hollywood.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did he mention any particular movie star at the time?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Excuse me for adding this, but I remember Jerome saying, "Their only use to the revolution is their bank account." That seems to sum up the party attitude.

Mr. STRIPLING. Regarding the actors?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did he discuss any particular actor who was a party member?

Mr. RUSHMORE. At this particular meeting Jerome—no, Lawson—Lawson referred to Lionel Stander as—I don't remember how the discussion came up, it was, I believe, how the comrades should behave in Hollywood, and what they shouldn't do, and Lawson cited Stander as a perfect example of how a Communist should not act in Hollywood.

Mr. STRIPLING. Regarding Hollywood matters, was Jerome the boss or was Lawson the boss?

Mr. RUSHMORE. It was a sort of chain of command. We might call Lawson the top sergeant out there in Hollywood, who took his orders from Jerome. In town Jerome would take his orders either from Trachtenburg or Gerhart Eisler, who was the Communist International representative.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether any other party members besides Jerome ever went to Hollywood?

Mr. RUSHMORE. There was one instance of Joe North—I will quote here from the Daily Worker of April 8, 1939.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you identify Joe North?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Joe North is editor of the New Masses. The Daily Worker of that date says:

Editor Joe North of the New Masses has been visiting in town.

This story was under a Hollywood date line.

He spoke at the dinner symposium for the Spanish refugees held last Sunday * * *.

That was about the time that I met Joe North on the streets of the city and in talking to me he said he had been to Hollywood. He said he had been very successful, the New Masses was pretty broke, and he had raised \$20,000 in one week.

Mr. STRIPLING. In Hollywood?

Mr. RUSHMORE. In Hollywood. And, looking back on that, it is very probable, and it often happened, that Joe North made a collection speech or two for the Hollywood committee to aid the Spanish refugees or some other similar allegedly anti-Fascist or allegedly anti-Franco organization, and that money raised was taken right to the New Masses.

He complained, I remember particularly, about one star, John Garfield. Joe said he had gone to Garfield—he went to a number of individuals to get their collection—and he said Garfield wouldn't give him any money and indicated he didn't want to at any time, and Joe told me then "That is what happens to our comrades when they go to Hollywood." He described Garfield and a couple of others as dopes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know of any Communist writers in Hollywood, yourself?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Well, through those 3 years I never visited Hollywood. My sole meetings were in New York. I remember seeing Clifford Odets a number of times at the Daily Worker, often in the evenings, conferring with various editors of the paper. I remember one meeting I saw him with Harry Jannis. Harry Jannis, the late Harry Jannis, was foreign editor at that time of the Daily Worker, and often writers and other people would meet with Jannis to get the particular party line on Soviet foreign policy which they wove into whatever they might have been writing at the time.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know a Powell Peters who was on the staff of the Daily Worker at the time you were employed there?

Mr. RUSHMORE. It might have been an assumed name. They used a number of pseudonyms. I don't remember anyone by that name.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know a Harbord Allen?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Not under that name.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not any Hollywood writers contributed articles to the Daily Worker?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Well, in one case I remember that Dalton Trumbo—at that time I was handling the magazine section of the Sunday paper, and a member of the Daily Worker staff who had innumerable contacts in Hollywood and on Broadway, Sam Warshawsky, said that he knew Trumbo very well, and that Trumbo would be glad to write for our

magazine section. Sam made the contact and Trumbo sent the article in, which was approved and published in the Sunday Worker magazine section.

In addition we had a Hollywood correspondent at that time by the name of Gordon Casson. I was told to write to Casson and tell him to get full page interviews and profiles of various Hollywood personalities who were either in the party or very friendly to the party. That was stressed, that they had to be friendly to the party, and perhaps such an article would help them over into actual membership. We had articles, which were published at the time, on James Wong Howe, the photographer, on John Bright, screen writer, Phillip Dunn, and a number of others.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Donald Ogden Stewart ever write any articles for the Daily Worker?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Not while I was there. However, I remember at a faction meeting, that is, at a meeting of the Communist Party members, the League of American Writers, Stewart was discussed as a president, coming president for the organization, and he was referred to by one of the members present as Comrade Stewart.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know Charlie Chaplin?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I never met Mr. Chaplin.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did he ever submit any articles to the Daily Worker?

Mr. RUSHMORE. No, he did not; not to my knowledge.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did the Daily worker have any policy regarding Charlie Chaplin?

Mr. RUSHMORE. He was what we call in the newspaper business a "sacred cow."

Mr. STRIPLING. What do you mean by that?

Mr. RUSHMORE. That is a newspaper phrase which—well, loosely, would mean someone that you always give favorable publicity to and a lot of it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were there any other sacred cows in the movie industry?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I might in this connection make it "sacred red cows."

Edward G. Robinson would fall in that category. We had a number of very complimentary articles on Robinson. I think we had one full-length magazine piece, as I remember it.

Jerome once told me to always defend Robinson, even if he was in a bad picture, with a bad performance. I didn't question Jerome's orders so I went ahead and did that. But I don't know whether or not Robinson is a Communist. I have no knowledge of that. But 10 years ago, or more, he started joining one Communist front after another, perhaps innocently, but after 10 years he is still doing it.

I noticed that last week in Cleveland there was a meeting for the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born. That was labeled on page 1 of practically every newspaper of 1943 as a Communist front by Attorney General Biddle.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is it a Communist front?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Certainly.

Mr. STRIPLING. You should know, having been a member of the party.

Is the League of American Writers a Communist front?

Mr. RUSHMORE. It was founded by the Communist Party and at its first convention in May 1935, was addressed by Earl Browder, Mike Gould, and a number of other prominent Communists.

I might add, when I spoke of this meeting last week, Robinson was a sponsor of this organization 10 years after he started joining the others.

And it is interesting to note that among the other sponsors of this Communist front group, which is going along, as of a week ago, are Albert Maltz, another Hollywood writer; Howard DeSilva, actor; Howard K. Sorrell, the union leader, so-called, in Hollywood; Howard W. Kenny, the attorney in California, and a number of other Hollywood people.

Mr. STRIPLING. You mentioned that John Howard Lawson asked the party to send writers to Hollywood. Can you name some of the writers that you sent to Hollywood?

Mr. RUSHMORE. Well, I didn't send any writers.

Mr. STRIPLING. I am sorry. I didn't mean to infer that you did. I am speaking of the party.

Mr. RUSHMORE. That would be the job of the cultural commission with Jerome and Trachtenburg approving it.

One writer I know went out there, and I am sure that he was sent by the cultural commission, was Alvah Bessie, whom I met several times at the Daily Worker, upon his return from Spain, where he was a commissar in the International Brigade in Spain.

There are some others who went to Hollywood, who were Communists. Albert Maltz I have named. Michael Blankforth.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did these people independently go to Hollywood, or did they have to have the permission of the cultural commission? In other words, were they sent there or did they go there on their own?

Mr. RUSHMORE. They would be sent there, because every writer who was a member of the Communist Party had to submit any manuscript to his cultural commission for approval before it goes to the publisher and, therefore, any writer going to Hollywood, who is a party member, a loyal party member, would have to have the approval of the cultural commission.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know Clifford Odets?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I saw him at the Daily Worker several times. I might add that at the Daily Worker it was a hard-and-fast rule that only party members trusted by the party could get within the gates.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Rushmore, are you familiar with the flip-flop which Mr. Albert Maltz had to perform in the New Masses for criticizing certain party strategy?

Mr. RUSHMORE. I followed that with some interest. That was long after I left the Communist Party. But it indicated how complete this control is over a writer who still stays within the ranks. Maltz came out with only a minor criticism of a particular party policy, and he was blasted for several weeks by various Communist editors and some Communist writers. He was forced to recant completely and apologize.²⁹

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood?

²⁹ See pp. 152-162.

Mr. WOOD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Rushmore, did you name the Epworth League as a Communist front?

Mr. RUSHMORE. No, no. They had influence in a couple of Epworth Leagues in New York. I knew that because one girl on the Daily Worker had been ordered to join an Epworth League and in about a month she had that league under that control and it adopted all sorts of resolutions. They are wonderful organizers.

Mr. McDOWELL. I think I was a dues-paying member of that at one time.

The CHAIRMAN. You belonged to a good organization.

Mr. RUSHMORE. This was one small branch of one church, I might add.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Rushmore.

The CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Morrie Ryskind in the audience?

Mr. RYSKIND. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Stripling, put on the next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Morrie Ryskind.

The CHAIRMAN. Raise your right hand, please. Mr. Ryskind, do you solemnly swear to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. RYSKIND. So help me God.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF MORRIE RYSKIND

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Ryskind, will you state your full name and present address, please?

Mr. RYSKIND. Morrie Ryskind; 605 North Hillcrest Road, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Ryskind?

Mr. RYSKIND. New York City, October 20, 1895.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. RYSKIND. I am a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the questions for Mr. Ryskind will be asked by Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Ryskind, how long have you been a writer?

Mr. RYSKIND. Oh, I would say about 25 years or so.

Mr. SMITH. How do you spell your last name, please, Mr. Ryskind?

Mr. RYSKIND. R-y-s-k-i-n-d.

Mr. SMITH. And in the past 20 or 25 years as a writer, what has been the nature of your writings?

Mr. RYSKIND. I have written for both the stage and the screen.

Mr. SMITH. As a matter of fact, Mr. Ryskind, I believe you were the writer of Of Thee I Sing and The Louisiana Purchase, is that correct?

Mr. RYSKIND. Yes, and a couple of flops in between, which I am glad you didn't mention.

Mr. SMITH. Well, actually I believe you received the Pulitzer Prize for *Of Thee I Sing*, is that correct?

Mr. RYSKIND. That is right, together with my collaborators George S. Kaufman, who wrote the book, and Ira Gershwin, who wrote the lyrics.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Ryskind, how long have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. RYSKIND. About a dozen years or so.

Mr. SMITH. And during the time that you have been there, what have your activities consisted of?

Mr. RYSKIND. Writing for the screen.

Mr. SMITH. During that particular time, have you had an opportunity to observe whether or not there is any Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry or in Hollywood?

Mr. RYSKIND. Well, I would say that you would have to be deaf, dumb, and blind not to observe those activities. The fact is, as Rupert Hughes said yesterday, that even if you lost all of those and still kept your nose the odor would tell you.

Mr. SMITH. What would you say these activities consisted of, Mr. Ryskind?

Mr. RYSKIND. It would almost be easier to tell you the activities they didn't take part in. I would divide them roughly into two groups: First, the general commie fronts for suckers; and then, secondly, the effort to take over the different guilds and crafts in the movie industry.

Mr. SMITH. Can you give us some examples of those? Are you familiar with the League Against War and Fascism and its history?

Mr. RYSKIND. Yes, I am very well familiar with that. That was one of the fronts that my wife joined. My wife has a very keen interest in civil liberties, as I think I have. She went to a meeting one day and came back and told me she had joined this League Against War and Fascism, I believe it was called. I looked over the list of names on it and said, "This looks to me like a commie front." She said, "Why, the organization meeting I went to spoke only about civil liberties. You believe in that, don't you?" I said, "Yes, but I am not sure the commies on this list do."

In about 3 weeks she resigned. She came to me and said, "You were right; they are interested in civil liberties, but only for Communists, not for Americans."

Shortly after that, the league was exposed as a Communist front. It changed its name—a typical Communist trick—to, I think first it was The League Against War and Fascism and then it became The League for Peace and Democracy, another noble-sounding name. Then, when that was exposed, I think at the time of the Hitler-Russian pact, they called it The League for War Against Fascism. Now, mind you, this started as the League Against War and Fascism. It now became a League for War Against Fascism. I don't know what its present name is, if it is still in existence—probably the "League to Get Americans Out of Greece and Henry Wallace into the White House," I wouldn't know.

Mr. SMITH. What about the League of American Writers, Mr. Ryskind?

Mr. RYSKIND. Well, that is another one I know about.

By the way, I just want to say one thing in fairness to her. My wife arrived here today and I want to say that joining that league

was the only mistake she has ever made in the 18 years we have been married.

The league—what was that now?

Mr. SMITH. The League of American Writers.

Mr. RYSKIND. The League of American Writers; I remember I was asked to join that. I had already belonged to the Authors League. This looked to me like a political front and I saw no reason to join it. That was later exposed as a Communist front. I think Donald Ogden Stewart at a meeting of the league got up and said publicly, "Communism does not need American writers, but American writers do need communism." That is Donald Ogden Stewart's opinion and not mine that I am giving, of course.

Then later on, I want to say, I remember John Dos Passos, one of our best American writers—

Mr. SMITH. Will you spell that, please?

Mr. RYSKIND. John—J-o-h-n, Dos—D-o-s, Passos—P-a-s-s-o-s. Mr. John Dos Passos received an award from the league, I think in his first year, as one of our great American writers. But the next year he made a mistake. He wrote an article attacking communism. He was promptly denounced by the league. I don't know whether he got the award back or not. They went pretty well for a time. To my knowledge, then even got President Roosevelt to agree to be a member. A friend of mine, Dr. Sidney Hook, of New York University, called up the White House, informed them of the nature of the league, and the President's membership was withdrawn and all publicity on that was withheld.

Mr. SMITH. Are there any other organizations such as the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League that you are familiar with?

Mr. RYSKIND. I am familiar with so many.

Oh, I think, in all fairness, since I told one on which my wife was victimized, I ought to tell about one in which I was victimized. Let us even this up. These different commie fronts—well, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party I think are very bigoted because they get money mainly from Republicans or Democrats. Now, the Communist has so skillfully devised it that he gets money not only from Communists but from non-Communists through these fronts, a suggestion which I recommend to the other parties.

For example, let us take the Scottsboro case. Like most Americans who think they are liberals, I read the account of the case and it seemed to me that the colored boys in the case would not get a square deal unless they had better representation than I thought was coming to them. I am sure a good many Americans thought the same thing, rightly or wrongly. I found out afterward that the money—they collected an awful lot of money—a good part of that money, went into the hands of the Daily Worker. My authority for that last statement is Mr. Morris Ernst, who was my attorney when I was in New York, and I think you can get further confirmation from Mr. Roger Baldwin of the American Civil Liberties Union.

I have one more incident about being victimized, again due to the fact that I thought I was a liberal. That was the Tom Mooney case. If you remember, John Finerty carried that to the Supreme Court. A lot of us thought that since the members of the original jury who were still alive said that if they had had the evidence before them, the new evidence before them, they would not have convicted Mooney—I

felt that I ought to chip in to get Mr. Mooney a new trial in California. I got together several hundred dollars, by getting some of my friends to chip in with me. This was at Mr. Finerty's request.

Some time after that, a group of people came to the house and said they had heard I had been collecting money, showed me their credentials and I gave them the money. About a week later, Mr. Finerty arrived in California, and my wife and I met him at the airport. We had dinner together, and I very proudly told him of the several hundred dollars I collected and told him I had given it to them, whereupon Mr. Finerty almost fainted. He said, "My God, you have given that money to the Communists. They don't want to get Mooney out of jail. Their whole object is to keep him in jail."

There were two instances in which I was victimized.

Now, I would like just to ask one thing: When an ordinary crook who is not a Communist—and we have some of those—sells you a bill of goods and misappropriates the money you have a chance to investigate him, prosecute him and send him to jail, and everybody says, "Fine." But if the crook is a Communist who sells you one bill of goods—let us say milk to starving Bulgarians or the freeing of innocent prisoners—and then doesn't deliver, of course you mustn't then say anything about it, because you are interfering with civil rights and, as I see by the Daily Worker here, Senator Pepper will bawl you out for it.

MR. SMITH. It has been your experience, then, that these front organizations attempt to use the people connected as writers or otherwise in the motion-picture industry as examples here where they have attempted even to use you; is that correct?

MR. RYSKIND. That is right.

MR. SMITH. What experience have you had so far as the guilds and unions themselves are concerned? In other words, are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild, Mr. Ryskind?

MR. RYSKIND. No; but I was a member.

MR. SMITH. How long were you a member, and during what period?

MR. RYSKIND. When I came to Hollywood in 1935 or '36 I had been a member of the Dramatists Guild in New York and of the Authors League. There was a fight on, apparently, to recognize this guild. Believing in collective bargaining, I saw no reason why writers shouldn't have a guild, as actors have. I fought for the guild. After the Wagner Act the guild was recognized and I was made a member of the board of directors. We had roughly some 15 members on the board. Now, you have got to realize that most of us who are Americans are not used much to political trickery. Here we were, 15, and we thought everybody was in there pitching for the good of the guild. We found after a while—we were very naive—that about 7 of the 15 voted together on every doggone question that came up. The question didn't have to be important. Whether the question was whether the next meeting should be on Friday, or whether we should ask the producers for better terms, it was always the same, with the result that these seven, although they constituted a minority, won every point. The rest, being Americans, would normally divide on any question.

MR. SMITH. Was that in the Screen Writers Guild?

MR. RYSKIND. That was in the Screen Writers Guild.

MR. SMITH. Approximately when?

MR. RYSKIND. In 1936, right after its recognition in 1936.

Mr. SMITH. Were there individuals on the board of directors of the Screen Writers Guild at any time that you know were Communists—members of the party or fellow travelers?

Mr. RYSKIND. Yes. It was very evident to us that the group that formed the caucus were members of the party and followed the party line.

Mr. SMITH. How many people are there on the board?

Mr. RYSKIND. I don't know what goes on now, but as I remember there were 15 people on the board.

Mr. SMITH. That was approximately when?

Mr. RYSKIND. 1936.

Mr. SMITH. Fifteen people on the board. Very well.

Mr. RYSKIND. On the executive board. As I say, some of these followed the party line.

Mr. SMITH. Some of them followed the party line?

Mr. RYSKIND. That is right.

Mr. SMITH. Do you recall any particular election at that time?

Mr. RYSKIND. I can remember the subsequent election very well. We didn't like it, when we discovered that seven people had voted together on everything. We said, "Let us caucus."

Mr. SMITH. By "we," who do you mean, Mr. Ryskind?

Mr. RYSKIND. I mean the other eight.

Mr. SMITH. I see. Proceed.

Mr. RYSKIND. What we decided to do—as I say, it took almost a year to find this out—

Mr. SMITH. Will you talk just a little louder, and into the microphone, please.

Mr. RYSKIND. I am sorry. The following year we decided to get up our own slates, in other words, to remove what we felt was a Communist faction in the guild. We got up our own slate of 15, and we did what they had been doing. We got out. We electioneered. We campaigned. We had, going into the meeting, the election meeting that night, a substantial majority—I would say 3 to 1. Our secretary, who was a very active worker, having learned something from the Commies, had in his pocket 500 proxies, which I think would have been enough to win the election if everybody there had voted the other way.

Mr. SMITH. At that particular time, who were, to the best of your recollection, the people on the board? Can you name the seven members that you thought were communistic?

Mr. RYSKIND. I will try to, although I may confuse one here with another. Let me try to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, I would suggest that in view of the uncertainty in the mind of the witness he supply the committee, for the record, with these names. I don't want him to make any misstatement.

Mr. SMITH. Can you supply us with those names at a later date, Mr. Ryskind?

Mr. RYSKIND. Yes; I can.

Mr. SMITH. Very well. I ask that the names there be withdrawn from the record and that a list be supplied later.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Will you proceed and tell how that election took place?

Mr. RYSKIND. When we went in that night, as I say, there were two slates to be presented. This had become known to everybody in

Hollywood. It was common talk that the moderates had gotten up a slate of their own to try to defeat the leftists.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, you were attempting to get control back of the Screen Writers Guild at that time?

Mr. RYSKIND. That is right.

Mr. SMITH. Very well.

Mr. RYSKIND. I urged Mr. Charley Brackett, a very well-known writer—

Mr. SMITH. He was the then president?

Mr. RYSKIND. He was the then president of the guild. I said to Mr. Brackett, "Let's watch for the trick tonight. I know the Communists don't give up easily. There must be a trick." He said, "Look, we've got the votes in our pocket. What are you worried about?"

I said, "Just watch for the trick." We came into the meeting. Mr. Brackett made his speech, in which he said that this was—the usual political speech—a very healthy indication in the guild that this year there were two tickets from which the members could choose, and he offered those tickets on the floor.

Now, at that moment, Lester Cole got up—

Mr. SMITH. Will you identify Lester Cole?

Mr. RYSKIND. Lester Cole is a member of the guild. I am not certain whether he was on the board then or not.

Mr. SMITH. Is he a writer?

Mr. RYSKIND. He is a writer, a writer at Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. I think Mr. Mayer identified him.

Mr. SMITH. As of now?

Mr. RYSKIND. Yes; as of now. I don't know where he was at that time. Mr. Cole pulled, I think, a very skillful political trick. It was a beautiful one and I repeat it bitterly, but my hat is off to him for that. He got up and said, "Look"—he pulled the Communist cry—"Let's not split among ourselves. We have only one enemy—the producers. Any fight among ourselves will be welcomed by the producers."

Now, they had beautifully done, at different intervals, this maneuver—four or five men, all commies, springing up all around the hall and saying, "Hurray, hurray, hurray." One of them I recognized as a member not of the Screen Writers Guild, but as a Communist who was in the furniture business. How he got there I don't know. That was their business. But he was cheering as loud as anybody, I can assure you. They kept yelling and cheering. It was like a political parade, at least those I have seen staged in the movies. Our own members began doing it. Mr. Brackett was up there. I said, "Never mind their yelling. That is a trick. Get the vote." "Look, our own members are doing it." I said, "Never mind. Get the vote."

Brackett said, "I can't. Our own members are doing it." The thing was accepted, not unanimously, because I yelled against it to the very last.

That night the commies held a celebration. In other words, they held the seven members over for another year. Mr. Brackett heard about it and the next morning he apologized, but I submit it was too late.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, through that means they were able to continue their control for the next year of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. RYSKIND. They were able to continue those seven men. And I

would say from that time on they had taken over the Guild, slowly but surely getting more Communist members on the board. I finally got out in about 1942. I just tired of paying dues to an institution that didn't represent me.

Mr. SMITH. In other words, it is your opinion that the Screen Writers Guild is controlled and dominated by Communists?

Mr. RYSKIND. I would say that today, under the leadership of Mr. Emmett Lavery, the guild is completely controlled by the Communists. I think that is proven by the publication, *The Screen Writer*, which is edited by Mr. Gordon Kahn.

Mr. SMITH. Do you know Mr. Gordon Kahn?

Mr. RYSKIND. I do. We don't agree politically. Mr. Kahn happens to be a neighbor of mine. In fact, he bought the house next door to me. We don't talk; but he is very pleasant to my children; I am pleasant to his; our dogs are very good friends. That is all.

Mr. SMITH. In your opinion, is Gordon Kahn a Communist or a fellow traveler?

Mr. RYSKIND. Well, this will not increase neighborly relations, but that is my opinion.

Mr. SMITH. You mentioned Mr. Cole. What is your opinion as to whether or not he is a Communist or fellow traveler?

Mr. RYSKIND. Well, if Lester Cole isn't a Communist, I don't think Mahatma Gandhi is an Indian.

Mr. SMITH. Do you have any suggestions that you would like to offer for the consideration of the committee as to how this problem in Hollywood should be dealt with, or in other places?

Mr. RYSKIND. I don't know. I realize fully the tough job that you have. I think we all believe in and want to protect our civil liberties. I see the danger. But I also feel that we didn't get the Bill of Rights in order to protect quislings. And I think if we are going to spend \$12,000,000,000, or whatever it is, to contain the Communists in Greece, we ought to spend at least a couple of bucks over here and do something about that. What good is there doing it over there and not getting rid of it here?

Look, I wouldn't want a bill that would hurt the political expression of any American, but I think it has been proved beyond any doubt that the American Communist Party is not an American Communist Party. If it were, I am afraid I would be sucker enough to defend its right to speak and to preach, but it has been proven it isn't. It is an agent of a foreign government, as the Bulgarian Communist Party is, as the Korean Communist Party is, as the German Communist Party is. It seems to me that by this time, beyond any shadow of doubt, we have proven it. And I don't believe it is up to us to protect the rights of quislings against the rights of American citizens, because they do assail our rights. They use the techniques of character assassination, and if they ever get control of the screen or of the country, it won't be just characters they will assassinate.

I don't know just how you can do it, but I do think it is your problem and I hope to God you do it.

I do also think—this may not be pertinent to you, but I think—would you mind very much if I made a suggestion to the producers?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I don't think you should do that. I think you should let well enough alone.

Mr. RYSKIND. You think I have done enough, all right.

The only trouble is the producers won't listen to me.

The CHAIRMAN. We will make the proper suggestion.

Mr. SMITH. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

Mr. RYSKIND. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Ryskind.³⁰

Mr. RYSKIND. Thank you.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, it is now 25 minutes to four. If you would like another witness, we are prepared to put on another witness. However, I suggest we recess now.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we better recess now until tomorrow.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make an announcement. We are getting slightly behind with our witnesses. In addition to the witnesses we announced last night might be witnesses today and who were not witnesses, we will also try to have as witnesses tomorrow Mr. Ronald Reagan, Mr. Robert Montgomery, Mr. George Murphy, and Mr. Gary Cooper.

The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 4:35 p. m., an adjournment was taken.)

³⁰ See appendix, p. 530, for exhibit 41.

HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

The record will show that Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, Mr. Nixon and Mr. Thomas are present. A subcommittee is sitting.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator, Messrs. Louis J. Russell, H. A. Smith, and Robert B. Gaston, investigators, and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Fred Niblo.

The CHAIRMAN. Everybody please be seated.

Mr. Niblo, do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. NIBLO. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF FRED NIBLO, JR.

Mr. SMITH. You are Mr. Fred Niblo, Jr.?

Mr. NIBLO. That is right.

Mr. SMITH. Spell your last name, please, Mr. Niblo.

Mr. NIBLO. N-i-b-l-o.

Mr. SMITH. And where do you live?

Mr. NIBLO. 1927 Rodney Drive, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. SMITH. Where and when were you born, Mr. Niblo?

Mr. NIBLO. New York City, January 23, 1903.

Mr. SMITH. How long have you lived in Hollywood, Mr. Niblo?

Mr. NIBLO. Oh, approximately 20 years.

Mr. SMITH. How long have you been connected with the motion-picture industry?

Mr. NIBLO. Almost the same length of time—19 years.

Mr. SMITH. Are you a professional writer?

Mr. NIBLO. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. And how long have you been a professional writer?

Mr. NIBLO. Seventeen years.

Mr. SMITH. During that period of time you have worked for and with what studios?

Mr. NIBLO. Practically all of them.

Mr. SMITH. Could you name some of them that you have worked with?

Mr. NIBLO. Warner Bros., Twentieth Century-Fox, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Columbia, RKO.

Mr. SMITH. At the present time, whom are you employed by?

Mr. NIBLO. I am employed by Eagle Lion Studios at the present time.

Mr. SMITH. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. NIBLO. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. How long have you been a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. NIBLO. I belonged to the old guild prior to its inactivation in 1936. The revived or reactivated guild I belonged to 6 or 7 years.

Mr. SMITH. During the time that you have been associated with the Screen Writers Guild and a writer in Hollywood, have you at any time observed anything that you would feel is communistic influence in the guild, the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. NIBLO. Very definitely.

Mr. SMITH. Would you explain why you arrived at that conclusion and how?

Mr. NIBLO. I noticed this very definitely—in fact, I am convinced—that the Screen Writers Guild has been the spark plug and the spear-head of the Communist influence and infiltration in Hollywood.

I would like to preface this with a statement. There is a sense in which I hate to spout these decisions. This is my guild. I believe in the guild as such. I think we should have a guild out there. And there is no denying that this guild has done some economic good for the working writers. But my testimony wouldn't be complete unless I also took note of the group of moderates which has been formed, the moderate movement which has boiled up in the guild in the last 15 months and which is endeavoring to wrest some of the control from the Communist faction and which has already succeeded in instituting some reforms.

I might say that Mr. Emmett Lavery has associated himself with this moderate movement.

However, if you want me to elaborate on what influence I saw—I hesitated to join the guild in the first place. I had been around Hollywood long enough to know that it was in control of John Howard Lawson and company, and I didn't want to tangle with those men. I didn't want to be involved in a fight. I held out as long as I could, but eventually I had to join the guild.

As soon as I got in, the suspicions I had of that kind of leadership were confirmed. I found that some of those characters whose names have been mentioned here throughout this testimony were in virtual control of the guild. They held the offices—not all of the offices, but most of them. They were the floor whips, so to speak—the majority. They were the obvious leaders of the guild.

That is one of the evidences that I adduce. Another one is the fact that I had no sooner gotten in the guild when I began receiving things. I wondered where they got my name and address, for their mailing lists. Announcements from outfits with names such as the League for the Promotion of American-Russian Friendship. May I say this was discontinued very quickly. This is some years ago. Some other

people complained about the same thing, and we had no more trouble about it.

Now, I have some notes, if you want me to refer to them.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Niblo, were you ever attacked by the guild or in the guild for any articles that you wrote?

Mr. NIBLO. Yes; I have been attacked by the guild several times.

Mr. SMITH. Because of your anti-Communist activity?

Mr. NIBLO. For no other reason.

Mr. SMITH. And will you explain?

Mr. NIBLO. The first time that I felt I was pretty badly smeared was shortly after I joined the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals. Shortly after that a two-page paid advertisement appeared in our Hollywood trade press linking me and some others up by name with a political figure who was unpopular in Hollywood at the time, Senator Reynolds. For better or for worse, I never had any connection with the Senator in one way or another. This was intended as a smear. This is a technicality, but the ad was actually taken by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, which was linked, in an interlocking connection, with the guild.

Our organization, the Motion Picture Alliance, was practically put on trial before the guild some time later. While they made no attempt to discipline those of us who were members of the guild, nevertheless the whole atmosphere suggested a Moscow purge trial.

I remember that one character jumped up from the floor and—Sam Wood had previously made the mistake of saying, "We are Americans." This character wanted to know what we meant by calling ourselves Americans. That has been the whole atmosphere for years in that guild.

I no sooner got into it than I found strike talk going on. This strike talk was not necessarily Communist itself. I believe they were negotiating with the producers, who may have been proving difficult. I do remember a dialogue between John Howard Lawson and Boris Ingster. To some people it sounded very fishy, as though it had been rehearsed in caucus—

Mr. McDOWELL. Do you remember who it was who said, "What do you mean we are Americans?"

Mr. NIBLO. I don't remember his name, so I can't identify him any further. As a matter of fact, he was a French national himself. He might have been an American citizen. He seems to be very much left wing, but I can't think of his name offhand.

Again, as far as attacks are concerned, this represents to my mind something of an attack. I made two efforts to get the roster of the guild, frankly, to electioneer in order to turn out this same moderate group which is now formed. A couple of years ago, up to 15 months ago, the solid Americans in the Screen Writers Guild were staying away from meetings through apathy and disgust and even through psychological intimidation. I wanted to break that up. I made two electioneering efforts. I requested the executive committee to give me a roster, a list of my fellow members, and they refused to do so—once in July 1944 and once in February of 1945.

Finally, I was attacked in the official publication of the Screen Writers Guild, called *The Screen Writer*, in the column Letters to the Editor, public forum. Mr. Garrett Graham, whom I am sure is not a Communist, wrote a letter in which he criticized me. Also there is a

slightly obscene reference in it. It was quite a lengthy letter. I felt as though I should answer it. I felt I should enlighten Mr. Graham about some of the things I had seen going on in the guild while he was in the Marine Corps. I paid my respects to Lawson, Cole, and company—rather, my disrespect—

Mr. SMITH. Who is Mr. Cole?

Mr. NIBLO. I identify him as Lester Cole. I believe he is now vice president of the guild. He has been a leader of it for some years.

Mr. SMITH. What is your opinion of Mr. Cole as to whether or not he follows the Communist Party line in his activities?

Mr. NIBLO. It is my opinion that he definitely does.

Mr. SMITH. Very well, proceed with this letter.

Mr. NIBLO. In this letter I was attacked. I was criticized. It was the public-forum column. I felt I had a right to write another letter defending myself and attacking my attackers and also refuting the point that my opponents had made. I also am a subscriber to the Screen Writer ipso facto, because I am a member of the guild. My letter they refused to print. They refused to print it on the ground that it didn't make for unity, or something. I have the letter here in which they refused to print it. Let me see what ground they gave—

Mr. SMITH. May I see it?

Mr. NIBLO. "Not consonant with the friendly aims"—the friendly aims. You should have seen what they called me.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have Mr. Niblo read this into the record and identify it as a letter dated October 31, 1946, addressed to Mr. Fred Niblo, Jr., 1927 Rodney Drive, Los Angeles 27, Calif., on the paper of the Screen Writers Guild, Inc., over the signature of Harold J. Salemsen—S-a-l-e-m-s-o-n—for the editorial committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. NIBLO. Do you want me to read it aloud?

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. NIBLO (reading) :

SCREEN WRITERS' GUILD, INC.,
AFFILIATED WITH THE AUTHORS' LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.,
Hollywood 28, Calif.

Mr. FRED NIBLO, Jr.,
Los Angeles 27, Calif.

DEAR MR. NIBLO: The editorial committee of the Screen Writer has instructed me to inform you that, after giving your letter the same consideration that all material coming before it receives, it has decided against publishing it.

Without prejudice to its literary merit, it was unanimously agreed by the committee that the content of your offering is not consonant with the friendly aims of the Screen Writers' Guild which the magazine strives to foster.

Please accept my personal apologies for not having communicated this decision to you more promptly. It is just that I have been swamped and, as a result, gotten disorganized in my work here.

Very sincerely yours,

HAROLD J. SALEMSEN,
For the Editorial Committee.

You may have that copy.³¹

Mr. SMITH. I understand that the letter you wished to publish was your views on anti-Communists in the attack on you; is that right?

Mr. NIBLO. That was essentially the issue of the whole thing.

Mr. SMITH. In addition to this letter, did you receive other information as to why your letter would not be published?

Mr. NIBLO. No. I may say this, that I complained to the executive board of the guild after the election and we had gotten a couple of moderates on the board, when I thought it might be safe to go up there and complain. They assured me this sort of thing wouldn't happen again. I don't know whether they have kept their word or not. Subsequent witnesses may reveal whether they did or did not.

I also complained about the fact that Mr. Dalton Trumbo, who in my opinion is a Communist, was editing the magazine. They replied he was no longer editor of the magazine. I asked who was, and they said Mr. Gordon Kahn. In my opinion, that is like tweedledum and tweedledee.

Mr. SMITH. Is it your opinion that Mr. Gordon Kahn is a Communist?

Mr. NIBLO. That is my opinion, though I cannot prove it, any more than Custer can prove that the people who were massacring him were Indians. I have no documentary evidence of this, but I believe these people to be Communists.

Mr. SMITH. Was your letter ever published?

Mr. NIBLO. My letter was never published. At the time I went up to the board—they skipped a month because I didn't make the deadline—they sort of grudgingly offered to publish it, but by that time the issue was cold, by that time it was non sequitur, and I would have looked like more than a fool if they had.

Mr. SMITH. Are you familiar with the Hollywood Writers Mobilization?

Mr. NIBLO. I am.

Mr. SMITH. What is your opinion of that organization?

Mr. NIBLO. I think it is Red.

Mr. SMITH. By Red, you mean—

Mr. NIBLO. I mean communistic—more so if anything since the war than during the war, more so if anything since Emmett Lavery ceased to be a member of the officer personnel of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization.

Mr. SMITH. You mentioned a while ago that the Screen Writers Guild publishes a magazine. What is the name of that?

Mr. NIBLO. The Screen Writer.

Mr. SMITH. And is that the magazine that you refer to that you felt Mr. Trumbo and Mr. Kahn were communistically controlling it?

Mr. NIBLO. Yes; that is the magazine I meant.

Mr. SMITH. Or is that your statement? This particular guild magazine, what is your opinion of that magazine.

³¹ See appendix, p. 531, for exhibit 42.

Mr. NIBLO. My opinion of the magazine is that it is sort of a literary monthly supplement to the Daily Worker. I think that everybody who reads or has read all the issues would come to the same conclusion. It strives to follow the party line. It may deviate, because I am not too familiar with all of the theology of the party line, but it is very left wing. It is excessively so.

Mr. SMITH. You feel that the magazine is used to sponsor left-wing ideas, Communist Party ideas?

Mr. NIBLO. To give you one idea. I recently saw—I haven't got the issue with me—an announcement, which was not a paid advertisement, in the Screen Writers Guild magazine, I believe, announcing courses for the Peoples Educational Center. Now, this Peoples Educational Center is a communistic center. I believe it has been identified by the Tenney committee in our State as a communistic school. The tenor of some of the articles—I may say that some of the attacks on me and on others—savor very definitely of left-wing bias, and that is putting it mildly.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Niblo, do you know of any instances when any officers of the Screen Writers Guild have resigned on account of anti-communistic pressure?

Mr. NIBLO. I believe I do. These officers of the Screen Writers Guild were simultaneously members of the committee, the executive committee of the League of American Writers. The League of American Writers I think has been identified, but I made a note of this. My authority is George Rockwell Brown, in the Examiner of Los Angeles of November 15, 1943, where the League of American Writers has been described as subversive by Public Law 135 and Public Law 644 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. Four of our board of governors or executive committee were simultaneously members of the governing body of the League of American Writers.

Mr. SMITH. Who were those four people?

Mr. NIBLO. Those four people were Lester Cole, John Howard Lawson, Donald Ogden Stewart, and Tess Schlessinger, deceased. Tess Schlessinger was the wife of screen writer Frank Davis, not to be confused with Professor Frank Davis, of UCLA.

Mr. SMITH. How do you spell Tess Schlessinger?

Mr. NIBLO. I am not certain offhand. I think it is T-e-s-s S-l-e-s-s-i-n-g-e-r. I suppose I did know at one time, because I had the—

Mr. SMITH. I think the correct spelling is S-c-h-l-e-s-s-i-n-g-e-r.

Mr. NIBLO. I am not much of a speller; I am sorry.

Mr. SMITH. Well, will you continue with that instance, please.

Mr. NIBLO. These people had joined with others of their organization in sending President Roosevelt a telegram protesting the then war-mongering activities of the United States Government. This was in June of 1941, just before the German invasion of Russia. They had protested the use of troops at the North American strike in Englewood. They, I believe, protested that the Communist Party was not allowed on the ballot of 40 States. They protested a great many things. When some of us in the guild found that out—chiefly under the leadership, I believe, of Richard Macauley—we demanded a special meeting in order to oust them. By the time the meeting occurred, it wasn't necessary to oust them. They had already stepped down, as I recall it, in favor of their alternates. By that time it was obvious, and Russia had

been attacked by Germany. However, it didn't do us much good, because the following November they or their kind were back in office again. I think that was the year that Mr. Sidney Buchman was elected president and Mr. Richard Macauley lost his, to be perfectly frank about it, quite openly, for which I honor him.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Niblo, what is the attitude of the Screen Writers Guild as to the investigation being conducted by this committee, in your opinion?

Mr. NIBLO. It may be that a large number of the Screen Writers Guild, speaking generally about screen writers, are in favor of it, or against it. I don't know that, but we had a meeting on August 14 last, a quorum meeting—

Mr. SMITH. That is August 14, 1947—this year?

Mr. NIBLO. 1947. A majority of the quorum which was present voted against this committee, in the following resolution—do you want me to read it?

Mr. SMITH. I would like to have you read it.

Mr. NIBLO. It is a long one.

Mr. SMITH. Let us see it. How long is it?

Mr. McDOWELL. What is the difference? Their opinion of this committee isn't important to us.

Mr. SMITH. Maybe not. I wanted to show that a resolution has been adopted opposing it. You can receive it for the record or not, whatever you say.

Mr. NIBLO. That failed to be unanimously carried because there were seven or eight, or more, who voted it down, but that was carried.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the resolution about?

Mr. NIBLO. Condemning this committee, the activity of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Un-American Activities Committee?

Mr. NIBLO. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think we need to have that.

Mr. SMITH. What suggestions have you to or for the committee at this time to handle the problem at hand, Mr. Niblo?

Mr. NIBLO. You mean the communistic problem?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. NIBLO. Well, I think that the definition of communism should be broadened to include not only those who can be proved to be carrying party cards, but those who consistently follow the party line.

You ask my opinion. I think it is grotesque that a Russian political party enjoys a legal existence as an American political party in this country.

Mr. SMITH. Do you think the party should be outlawed?

Mr. NIBLO. Yes. It has been objected to on the ground that they will go underground. I think they are already underground, insofar as it suits their purpose. It is a secret organization no less than the Ku Klux Klan. I myself feel that I am sick and tired of being harassed and irritated and even smeared by enemies of my country in my own country. I would like to appeal as a loyal citizen to this Congress for relief.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Witness, may I interrupt right there. I want to clarify the Chair's decision in regard to that letter. It is not that the committee is afraid to have the letter read. In fact, the Chair will

order it placed in the record, at the point of the testimony where it was brought up. But it is because we are criticized every day and every hour, and maybe we are praised every day and every hour. That doesn't influence us a great deal. We are just trying to do the best job we can.

Mr. NIBLO. I was merely answering——

The CHAIRMAN. We are not afraid, however, of the criticism. In fact, we welcome it. So the Chair will order the letter placed in the record at the point where the witness testified concerning it.

Mr. NIBLO. This is not a letter. It is a resolution which was passed.

The CHAIRMAN. A resolution. That is all right.

(The resolution referred to is as follows:)

The House Committee on Un-American Activities has announced that its hearings concerning Hollywood will commence September 23. It is apparent from the statements of committee members, investigators, and witnesses that the immediate target of these hearings will be the democratic guilds and unions of the picture industry. In the subcommittee hearings this spring, the Screen Writers' Guild was slanderously attacked as the center of subversive activity in Hollywood and afforded no opportunity to answer the charge. We are now sufficiently acquainted with the record and methods of this committee to know positively that there is no way to obtain a fair hearing under its auspices for our side of the case. For these reasons, and because every intelligent American knows that the eventual target of the committee is the freedom of the screen and American democratic rights in general, it is fitting that the Screen Writers' Guild should issue the following call to the other employee and employer organizations in the industry:

"That the various guilds, unions, and producer organizations in Hollywood unite in opposition to the conspiracy against the motion-picture industry between a few individuals within the industry and the controlling faction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; that these groups, representing the overwhelming majority sentiment of the industry, use every means at their disposal to expose in advance the nature and purpose of the so-called hearings now scheduled for September 23; and that these groups combine their talents and existing channels for appearing to public opinion in order to present our side of the story to the American people during and after the committee sessions in Washington."

Mr. SMITH. Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. NIBLO. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Richard Macaulay.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Macaulay.

Raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MACAULAY. I do.

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD MACAULAY

Mr. SMITH. Will you state your name, please, Mr. Macaulay?

Mr. MACAULAY. Richard Macaulay.

Mr. SMITH. Will you spell your name, please?

Mr. MACAULAY. M-a-c-a-u-l-a-y.

Mr. SMITH. Richard Macaulay?

Mr. MACAULAY. That is right.

Mr. SMITH. Where do you live, Mr. Macaulay?

Mr. MACAULAY. 9909 Robbins Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. SMITH. When and where were you born?

Mr. MACAULAY. Chicago, Ill., August 18, 1909.

Mr. SMITH. You are here in response to a subpoena heretofore served upon you? ³²

Mr. MACAULAY. I am.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Macaulay, what is your occupation?

Mr. MACAULAY. I am a writer.

Mr. SMITH. For whom?

Mr. MACAULAY. At the present moment Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.

Mr. SMITH. How long have you been a writer?

Mr. MACAULAY. About 20 years.

Mr. SMITH. A screen writer?

Mr. MACAULAY. No. Before that I was a magazine writer and a radio writer previous to that.

Mr. SMITH. For whom have you written? Will you name some of the people or organizations for whom you have written in the past 20 years, and your experience?

Mr. MACAULAY. Both of the broadcasting companies, the Saturday Evening Post, the magazines, Warner Bros., Columbia, RKO, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Universal.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Macaulay, how long have you been associated with the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MACAULAY. For the last 12 years with the exception of 3 years when I was in the service.

Mr. SMITH. Are you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. MACAULAY. I am.

Mr. SMITH. Do you actively participate in that organization?

Mr. MACAULAY. Yes; I do.

Mr. SMITH. And for what period of time?

Mr. MACAULAY. Ever since I have been in Hollywood, ever since the reactivation of the guild in 1936.

Mr. SMITH. In your opinion have there been any Communists in control or attempts to control the policies of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. MACAULAY. Yes. There always had been, I understood, before I came in but after we reorganized in 1936 such control became more and more evident.

Mr. SMITH. Can you explain some of the things that this group of people do that you feel are communistically inclined?

Mr. MACAULAY. To begin with, they have a constant program of intimidation. As time went on, only a very few would get up on the

³² See appendix, p. 531, for exhibit 43.

floor of the guild and attempt to oppose the controlling faction. There are some members of the guild who are booed and hissed the moment they arise before they open their mouths, on many occasions. This frequently seems to be the result of a well-organized clique. Even if they let you get up without bothering you, before you have proceeded five sentences into your remarks someone is certainly liable to start hissing you.

MR. SMITH. You say "this group." Whom do you mean by "they" or "this group"?

MR. MACAULAY. The Communists, and the boys who play along with them.

MR. SMITH. Are you able to identify some of these individuals, in your opinion?

MR. MACAULAY. Oh, yes.

MR. SMITH. Will you do so?

MR. MACAULAY. A lot of these people—a few of them may not be Communists. I might possibly be doing an injustice to some of them.

MR. SMITH. We would prefer you name only those in the guild whom you feel are Communists.

MR. MACAULAY. I am morally certain of all of them. I merely say if they habitually consort with bank robbers and the bank on the next street is knocked off they can't holler if someone blows the whistle.

They are: Alvah Bessie, Lester Cole, Gordon Kahn, Howard Koch, Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Albert Maltz, Samuel Ornitz, Waldo Salt, Robert Rossen, Dalton Trumbo, Guy Endore, Richard Collins, Marian Spitzer, Hugo Butler, Donald Ogden Stewart, Paul Trivers, Maurice Rapf, Henry Meyers, John Wexley, Ronald MacDougall, John Collier, Abraham Polensky, William Pomerance, Harold Buchman, Melvyn Levy, Clifford Odets, and Michael Blankfort.

MR. SMITH. Mr. Macaulay, have you had any experience writing any articles for the Screen Writers magazine?

MR. MACAULAY. Yes; I had such an experience. Alvah Bessie had written an article for the magazine sometime previous to my attempt. I attempted to answer this article. Mr. Bessie in his article complained about the things he could not write about because of capitalistic oppression both in the movies and in the general press and the magazine groups.

I answered this article, the basis of my article being this fact, that I was prevented from writing many things about which I would like to write because of the active interference of Mr. Bessie and his friends.

This article was turned down by Mr. Dalton Trumbo, the editor of the magazine.

MR. SMITH. How do you feel it was turned down?

MR. MACAULAY. Mr. Trumbo gave several remarkable reasons, one of them being that I had attacked minority groups, I had attacked the Roman Catholic Church. This was remarkable coming from Dalton Trumbo, doubly so, and the fact that I am a Roman Catholic. The reasons were completely specious, and obviously so.

MR. SMITH. What action, if any, did you then take?

MR. MACAULAY. Later on to one of the editors of the magazine I said, "It is obvious that there is no likelihood that anything I would write could be printed in the Screen Writer," and he said, "I think you are absolutely right."

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have these letters and I think they should be offered only as exhibits.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.³³
(The letters referred to are as follows:)

MARCH 9, 1946.

Mr. RICHARD MACAULAY,

Beverly Hills, Calif.

DEAR MR. MACAULAY: Thanks for your letter to Mr. Eugene Dooley, of which I just received the carbon copy. I will submit it to the editorial committee, which, I feel sure, will want to run it in the April Screen Writer (out about April 10).

Your interesting article on censorship will come up for final disposal at the editorial committee meeting next Thursday night and, from talks I have had with several members of the committee, I feel I can virtually assure you that it will be accepted for the April issue, as well.

Incidentally, if you receive a publishable answer from Mr. Dooley, I think our readers will be interested in what he has to say.

Thanks for your continued interest in the magazine.

Sincerely,

HAROLD J. SALEMSON,
Director of Publications.

MARCH 22, 1946.

Mr. RICHARD MACAULAY,

Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. MACAULAY: The editorial board has decided against publishing your article *Who Censors What?* and your letter to Mr. Eugene Dooley of St. Elizabeth's Church.

The material slanders four million Americans of Italian descent; it attacks organized labor; it takes the Government to task on issues which have nothing to do with screen writers; it contains statements which might be construed as incitement to attack upon various religious faiths, especially the Roman Catholic.

We do not question the courage of the Warsaw Poles who participated in General Bor's "magnificent, doomed uprising," just as we do not question the courage of the men and women who arose in that earlier and more surely doomed effort which came to be known as the battle of the Warsaw ghetto. The Alexander Hamilton film you proposed was done by Warner Bros. in 1932, starring the late George Arliss. It is, however, improbable that the picture fulfilled your requirements of portraying Jefferson as "our prime villain in history."

It is difficult to support your belief in "the inalienable right of man's mind to be exposed to any thought whatsoever, however intolerable that thought might be to anyone else." Frequently such a right encroaches upon the right of others to their lives. It was this "inalienable right" in Fascist countries which directly resulted in the slaughter of five million Jews.

Very truly,

DALTON TRUMBO,
(For the Editorial Committee of the Screen Writer.)

[From Variety, published October 14, 1946]

WHO CENSORS WHAT?

(By Richard Macaulay)

In a recent issue of the Screen Writer, Mr. Alval Bessie consumed eight pages of print in the proving of what every writer knows—namely, that there are certain forces which, all too often, successfully prevent a writer from presenting the truth, or his conception thereof. The only unique thing about Mr. Bessie's piece was his apparent assumption that writers seeking to interpret honestly the Spanish Civil War have been the only sufferers in this respect, although there was also the implication that any cause dear to the Writers'

³³ See appendix, p. 531, for exhibits 44-46.

Congress would have similar difficulties in reaching the motion picture screen.

It is not difficult to understand Mr. Bessie's preoccupation with the Spanish war. To the soldier, the biggest battle is the one in which he was hurt, or most frightened. The man who hit Iwo Jima on D-day will believe forevermore that this was the concentrated hell-hole of the war, although he cannot be expected to argue this successfully with a man who measures his beachheads by the standards of Salerno. And so, the war to Mr. Bessie is contained principally in Spain, although it is difficult for the average American soldier who served in north Africa and Sicily to think of the Italian soldier as a formidable opponent.

HERE COMES THE CENSOR

It is, in fact, this latter conception which has resulted in my own most recent contact with the subterranean forces of uncodified censorship. I wrote a story called *Trouble Near Bataglia*. It was a simple story, and in it my American soldiers had a definite attitude toward the Italian people. This attitude, as held by my soldiers, was undoubtedly shared by 95 percent of all American soldiers who served in Sicily or Italy. My story represented an accurate portrayal of an attitude that does exist, and widely.

The letter to my agent from the first magazine to which the story was presented began as follows: "Trouble Near Bataglia is a magnificent story, and naturally neither this magazine nor any other publication that we know of is going to print it."

AFRAID OF STINK

Now, of whom was this editor afraid? And the other editors, for whom he assumed to speak so authoritatively? (And accurately!) Well, I'll tell you. First of all, they are afraid of that segment of the Italian-American population which, correctly enough, still places the "Italian" first in the hyphenation of their citizenship. And secondarily, these editors are afraid of Mr. Bessie and his friends, knowing well their talent for creating an organized, well-publicized stink.

Let's start considering various things which you can't put on the screen. Let's take labor leaders. I think the life of James Caesar Petrillo would make a fascinating screen play. As a writer who thinks he knows dramatic material, I would like to have a few months to fool around with the life of Dan Tobin. I think that a motion picture honestly investigating the modus operandi of the building trade unions would have unlimited possibilities for entertainment, drama, and public enlightenment. But if I have to take time out and prepare a treatment, or a screen play, on any one of these three fertile subjects, what do you think my chances would be of selling? Negligible, naturally. And if any producer, new in town, were so stupid as to buy it, the project would still never reach the screen.

SAME OLD OPPOSITION

Aside from my obvious difficulties with the Messrs. Tobin and Petrillo and their families and the loyal members of their organizations, I greatly fear that I would encounter again determined opposition from Mr. Bessie and his friends, and unsavory words might be applied to me, such as "fink" and many other less printable.

On the other hand, I have seen a great many motion pictures where captains of finance and management have been depicted as cruel, avaricious men, devotedly concentrated on their own aggrandizement, and callously oblivious to the public weal. Also, the real American Faceless Man, the typical bourgeois, is portrayed consistently as a silly little fellow, devoid of any real decency or intelligence, and yet capable of almost any crime in the book, ranging from inept cupidity to grotesque murder.

BUSY BUSINESSMAN

However, nothing in the way of concerted protest happens in either of these cases. The national Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce have, by their very nature, limited memberships. These men ordinarily are too busy to organize boisterous minorities into effective weapons of suppression.

As for the Faceless Man, he is eternally unorganized, squeezed hard between management and labor, with his screams of anguish unprinted and unheard. This

group, unable effectively to protest its own assassination, certainly will never organize in protest against a motion picture.

In more general concepts of life, a picture which presented the thesis that unwedded bliss can be a pretty good thing, or that a woman who hates her husband should divorce him, would run into a blizzard of blows. Even granting the preposterous premise that the script of such a picture got by the Johnston office, what would happen to it after it reached the screen? The Legion of Decency, the Knights of Columbus, the Watch and Ward Society, and a thousand other organizations who watch broodingly over public morals would descend on the film with drooling jowl and bared fang.

STORY OF WARSAW

I freely admit that Mr. Bessie and his friends would raise no outcry against any of the proposed scenarios outlined in the above two paragraphs. Neither, I also admit, should anyone else in a society which even pretends to believe in the inalienable right of man's mind to be exposed to any thought whatsoever, however intolerable that thought might be to anyone else.

But I fear that Mr. Bessie might take a jaundiced view of any effort to bring to the screen General Bor's magnificent, doomed uprising in Warsaw, which perished for lack of aid even as Russian troops sat on the eastern bank of the Vistula. I use the word "magnificent" advisedly, speaking in terms of human courage. I am not prepared to pass on the politics that went into the situation. All I know is that the attempted liberation of Warsaw was a brave effort, of a people arising against a conqueror, only to have their high hope wither to bleak despair and ultimate starvation and defeat.

Yet I am afraid that if Mr. Bessie and friends did not try to stop the making of this picture, they would certainly speak very sternly against it, and perhaps, attempt to invoke sanctions.

"CONFESSIONS" AGAIN

Many honest citizens of this country regard communism with a fear and a horror equal to that which they bestow on fascism, nazism, or any other form of state authoritarianism. Some time before the war Warner Bros. produced a motion picture entitled "Confessions of Nazi Spy." This was a very good picture, timely, and, as proved by subsequent events, quite accurate in its premise. But what would happen now if some honest citizen attempted to make a picture with his fears and suspicions of the Soviet as his subject? I don't think Mr. Bessie would permit it, and of the many protest committees which would form immediately I think that a substantial percentage of the names could also be found on the membership list of the Screen Writers' Guild.

I think it amusing for Mr. Bessie to complain of something he can't write about, and here's why: There are so many things I wouldn't be able to write about because of Mr. Bessie.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Macaulay, do you think communism is a threat in the motion-picture industry in Hollywood?

Mr. MACAULAY. Yes; I do; very definitely. The way these men used to operate in the guild—

Mr. SMITH. The Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. MACAULAY. Yes. They made a man's name a byword and a hissing if he so much as dared mention the name of communism or say the word "Communist." By this indoctrination and inculcation that they gave to the vast middle mass of the guild they made it a terrible thing. A man was a moron or imbecile if he said the word "communism."

They have so successfully indoctrinated even well-meaning members of the guild with this idea that recently at a caucus of a bunch of moderates who dedicated themselves to trying to throw the Communists out at the forthcoming guild election in November, it was decided there not to use the word "Communist." Instead we referred to the opposition as the "Lester Cole faction."

Mr. McDOWELL. As the what?

Mr. MACAULAY. The "Lester Cole faction."

The CHAIRMAN. The record will show Mr. Wood is present. A quorum is present.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Macaulay, what do you feel could be done to oppose this threat?

Mr. MACAULAY. The obvious thing is to throw them out at the next election, if we can, within my own guild—and I have been speaking most specifically of the problem within my own guild. If we can vote them out of office we will certainly clip their wings.

In general, as far as the country goes, I definitely feel the Communist Party should be outlawed. I think it is not a political party at all; it is a seditious conspiracy and should be treated as such.

Mr. SMITH. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Macaulay, you said in naming a considerable list of people that you felt were Communists, that is, in your opinion, you did not want to do any of them an injustice. I think it might be well if you would indicate what specific actions these people generally indulged in which led you to form that opinion.

Mr. MACAULAY. Mr. Nixon, they have all followed the tortuous twists of the Communist Party line through Russia's various jumps, preceding and during the war. A man can accidentally join one or two Communist-front organizations, but when you find them in five, six, or seven I think the supposition is reasonable that he knows what he is doing.

Primarily these men have followed, no matter how ridiculous it got, the party line of the Communist Party. They have always voted as a group. You will never find any of these men I mentioned voting differently on a given question.

Mr. NIXON. In other words, you would summarize it in this way: They have consistently followed the Communist line in foreign policy?

Mr. MACAULAY. Yes.

Mr. NIXON. They have consistently belonged to Communist-front organizations?

Mr. MACAULAY. That is right.

Mr. NIXON. They have voted as a group with the Communists in every case?

Mr. MACAULAY. That is right.

Mr. NIXON. And they have indulged in this campaign of abuse against those who have indicated they might have some opposition to Communists?

Mr. MACAULAY. That is correct.

Mr. NIXON. And the fact that these people, all of whom you have named, have consistently participated in those activities; that is the basis for your opinion that they are Communists or that they are consistent Communist sympathizers?

Mr. MACAULAY. That is correct.

Mr. NIXON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, do you have any more questions?

Mr. SMITH. That is all, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Macaulay.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Your next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Mr. Robert Montgomery.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Montgomery, will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT MONTGOMERY

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Montgomery, will you state your full name and present address, please?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Robert Montgomery, 10430 Bellagio Road, Belair, Los Angeles 24, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Montgomery?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I was born in Beacon, N. Y.

Mr. STRIPLING. In what year?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. 1904.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am a director.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a director?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have been a director for the past 2 years and an actor for the last 20.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have been in Hollywood since 1929.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you serve in World War II?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. In what branch of the service?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. United States Navy.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of any guild at the present time?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir; I am a member of the Screen Actors Guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a member of the Screen Actors Guild?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have been a member and officer of the Screen Actors Guild since 1933.

Mr. STRIPLING. What positions have you held within the guild?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have held the position, first, of vice president of the guild; I have been either a member of the board or the president of the guild since 1933. I have held the position of president of the guild in the years 1935, 1936, and 1937 and was reelected again in 1946, resigning about 3 months after my election.

Mr. STRIPLING. During your tenure as president of the guild and as a member of the guild have you ever at any time noted any Communist influences operating within the guild?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. We have had in the Screen Actors Guild, as have other labor unions, a very militant, a very small minority, well organized, well disciplined. Those people have been active since as far back as 1933.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you tell the committee whether or not that group has ever been successful in dominating the policy of the guild at any given time?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. . . Never under any circumstances.

Mr. STRIPLING. What has been the policy of the guild regarding communism and fascism?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I think the answer to that question can be given best, Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me to read the resolution in that regard issued by the guild in 1946.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection so ordered.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have your permission, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you. [Reading:]

The Screen Actors Guild feels that its primary function is the honest representation of its membership in a legal and orderly manner by duly elected representatives in bringing about for its members the best possible working conditions, hours, and wage scales.

The Screen Actors Guild feels that once these working conditions, wage scales, and hours have been established, it is its duty, through its administrative staff, to see to it that the parties to the contract under which these conditions have been agreed to adhere strictly to the conditions as set forth in that contract.

In the past the talent groups of Hollywood in particular and the industry in general have been subjected to attacks via the press, radio, and governmental agencies which have been instrumental in leading the public at large to believe that this organization has other aims than those set down above. The accusations have been made publicly against the talent groups that they do not honestly function as they should in representing their members and have become sounding boards for ideologies inimical to the American way of life.

Recognizing that the words "Communist" and "Fascist" have been employed with recklessness and irresponsibility as terms of opprobrium, the Screen Actors Guild desires to make a public statement and to set forth the above points. The guild in addition states that it has in the past, does in the present, and will in the future rigorously oppose by every power which is within its legal rights, any real Fascist or Communist influence in the motion-picture industry or in the ranks of labor.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Montgomery, you introduced that resolution yourself?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir; I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did the introduction of it create any controversy within the Guild?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The resolution was introduced in, as I remember it, February 1946. The resolution was not made public until May, I believe, 1946. I would have to check those dates but I believe they are approximately correct—May or June of 1946.

In that period of time, between those two dates, the first two articles of the resolution pertaining to the duties of the guild appeared to cause no discussion whatsoever.

The third article in the resolution which came out flatfootedly against any real Communist or Fascist influence in the ranks of labor or in the motion-picture industry seemed to cause—again from a very small minority—a tremendous opposition. Whether that opposition was Communist or not, I am not qualified to state. I only know that

they behaved exactly as left-wing groups in various labor unions have behaved in the past and do behave at present.

They attempted in every possible way to cloud the issue of that last clause in the resolution.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was the resolution adopted?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The resolution was adopted and was issued publicly by the delegates of the Screen Actors Guild at the California State Labor Convention in 1946.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were any compromise or substitute resolutions offered during this controversy?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Compromise resolutions were offered, naturally, because that appeared to be one of the tactics of the opposition to that resolution. In all the compromise resolutions that were offered the flat statement that we opposed Communism or Fascism was strangely absent.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Montgomery, as a veteran of the Hollywood scene are you aware of any Communist influences in other guilds in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have heard a great deal of discussion about it. I am not a member of those other guilds and I assume that just as in the Screen Actors Guild there are again small active minorities within those other guilds.

Let me make this point perfectly clear, with your permission. The fact that these minorities are tiny does not, to me, change the picture as far as their danger is concerned. They are well organized, they are well disciplined. They appear at public meetings tremendously well organized and with a complete program for the evening.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Montgomery, they even appear at congressional hearings. [Laughter.]

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Montgomery, can you tell the committee whether or not in any picture in which you were an actor, or in any picture which you have produced, you have ever been aware of any effort to inject Communist propaganda or scenes which were unfriendly to the American way into such films or scripts?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have heard these people referred to as the lunatic fringe, and I quite agree with that definition. However, I do not think any of them would be crazy enough to try to inject Communist propaganda into a picture I had anything to do with.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your opinion regarding communism?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, in common with millions of other men in this country in 1939 and 1940 I gave up my job to fight against a totalitarianism which was called fascism. I am quite willing to give it up again to fight against a totalitarianism called communism. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The audience is the guest of this committee. This is a congressional committee seeking the facts. We do not care for any applause.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Montgomery, there are pending before this committee at the present time two bills which seek to outlaw the Communist Party. The committee has asked a number of people who are prominent in the motion-picture industry and who have appeared here their opinion as to whether the outlawing of the Communist

Party would serve to rid Hollywood, shall we say, of Communist influence. Naturally the Communists are entrenched in labor and many other fields, but as far as Hollywood is concerned do you think the Communist Party should be outlawed?

MR. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Stripling, I do not think I am qualified to answer that question in this respect: There are governmental agencies who, I am sure, have a tremendous amount of evidence regarding the Communist Party and its activities in this country. Those governmental agencies, I feel, and the Congress of the United States, are a great deal more qualified to decide as to whether the Communist Party should be outlawed as a political party in this country, or not.

If you are asking my personal opinion I do not believe it is a political party.

MR. STRIPLING. What do you consider it to be, Mr. Montgomery?

MR. MONTGOMERY. I consider it a subversive group just as I considered the German-American Bund a subversive group.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you consider it to be in fact the agent of a foreign government?

MR. MONTGOMERY. That again is a question of one's qualifications to make that decision. I assume from their behavior that they are and it has been testified to before this committee that they are.

MR. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood?

MR. WOOD. No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

MR. NIXON. Mr. Montgomery, you indicated that at the time this resolution was introduced there was great opposition from this small minority. The point I am interested in is this: You said they behaved as all left-wing groups behaved. Would you indicate very briefly to the committee some of the elements of behavior which in your opinion follow that line?

MR. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir. The confusion of the issue by long and protracted discussion is one of the maneuvers used by these people. I am afraid this sounds a little melodramatic, but character assassins of the proponents of the issue was another one.

MR. NIXON. Long and protracted discussion and character assassins were two of them?

MR. MONTGOMERY. Long and protracted discussion, let me say, with the aim in view of simply clouding the original issue of the resolution.

MR. NIXON. And not for the purpose of reaching a decision on the matter at hand?

MR. MONTGOMERY. No, sir; definitely not.

MR. NIXON. But for the purpose of avoiding a decision on the matter on which they wanted no decision made?

MR. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir; exactly.

MR. NIXON. I might say, Mr. Montgomery, despite the fact that during the course of this hearing, as the chairman has indicated, no applause can be allowed from the audience, I think I speak for the members of the committee and for the members of the audience in saying that although we may not openly express our approval we certainly wish to indicate to you it is very encouraging to find a man in your

position who has, throughout the United States, a great deal of respect among a great number of people for what you have done on the screen, so well able to express yourself articulately, intelligently, and fairly on a matter which is of great interest to this country at the present time.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Montgomery, have you been smeared as every other person has who has attacked communism?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir; I have.

Mr. McDOWELL. They have called you, I presume, a Fascist, a stooge of your producer, and all that sort of thing?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir; that is true. It does not bother me very much, quite frankly.

Mr. McDOWELL. That is very obvious. It is good to have you here. You are as good a citizen as you are an actor, and that is tops.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Do you have any more questions, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. No, sir, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, may I have your permission to make one statement?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; proceed.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have been watching and hearing via the press and radio the procedure here in this committee. I would like to ask the chairman's permission to correct one impression which I am sure is being unintentionally given by virtue of the reporting of these hearings.

I am sure, as I say, this impression is unintentional.

The general impression as we came across the country to these hearings was that there was a small minority within Hollywood fighting communism and fascism. This is exactly the reverse of the true picture. There is a small minority in Hollywood who might be interested in fascism or communism and I do not think that we who have worked in this industry for a period of almost 20 years, some of us, have any right to testify before this committee without saying that we are proud to be members of this industry.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Montgomery, for coming here today.³⁴

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STRIPLING. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. George Murphy.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. George Murphy.

Mr. Murphy, do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. MURPHY. I do, so help me God.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

³⁴ See appendix, p. 531, for exhibit 47.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE L. MURPHY

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Murphy, will you state your full name and present address, please?

Mr. MURPHY. George L. Murphy, 911 North Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Murphy?

Mr. MURPHY. New Haven, Conn., July 4, 1902.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

Mr. MURPHY. Actor-dancer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the questions of Mr. Murphy will be asked by Mr. Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. That is agreeable. Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Murphy, how long have you been connected with the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MURPHY. I have been employed in the motion-picture industry a little over 12 years.

Mr. SMITH. Are you a member of the Screen Actors Guild?

Mr. MURPHY. I am and have been a member for about 10 years.

Mr. SMITH. What offices have you held in the guild and do you presently hold an office?

Mr. MURPHY. At present I am a third vice president. Previous to that I was president of the Screen Actors Guild for two terms and for the last 6 years I have served as a member of the board of directors of the Screen Actors Guild.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Murphy, have you ever been a member of any group or organization that you would consider subversive?

Mr. MURPHY. No; I have not.

Mr. SMITH. Were any attempts ever made to get you to join any subversive group?

Mr. MURPHY. Well, when I was first made a member of the Screen Actors Guild board I strangely received the Daily Worker every day for a year, for which I did not pay, because I had not ordered it.

I have been invited to attend many meetings. I have been asked to donate funds to many causes. Possibly being of a suspicious nature I like to make sure where my charity funds go and I like to make sure of what is actually the purpose of the meeting I attend; so that I have not attended any of those meetings, to my knowledge, nor have I donated money to any of those funds.

Mr. SMITH. Have you ever joined any anti-Communist groups?

Mr. MURPHY. No; I have not as such. I am a member of the Screen Actors Guild and as you have just heard Mr. Montgomery read into the record we have a resolution that is anti-Communist and anti-Fascist so you might call us an anti-Communist, anti-Fascist group.

I am also chairman of a political group lately formed in Hollywood. Among the things it hopes to do is fight against communism and fascism.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Murphy, were you president of the Screen Actors Guild when the strike started?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; I was.

Mr. SMITH. What action did you take?

Mr. MURPHY. Well, immediately when the strike started the Screen Actors Guild formed a committee that met with the committee of the Screen Writers Guild and the Screen Directors Guild in the hope that

we could, as disinterested parties, find some means whereby the men could remain at work while the argument went on or until the strike was settled. We met once. There was a suggestion made as to how to proceed. I suggested we get the three parties to agree to abide by the decision of a proper governmental agency, which at that time would be the NLRB, since it was a jurisdictional strike.

This was agreed upon. We first called Mr. Edward Mannix, who was then an officer with the Producers Association. He said he would agree to sign or would say publicly that they would abide by the decision of such a proper governmental agency.

The second party called was one of the members of the striking unions. He told us in no uncertain terms his boys were out on strike and they would stay there for 7 years if necessary until a lot of things he was dissatisfied with in Hollywood got straightened out.

It was quite obvious we were going to accomplish nothing. Here was a man who had his neck bowed, who was mad, and was not interested in settling the strike.

MR. SMITH. Mr. Murphy, did this plan meet with any success?

MR. MURPHY. No success whatever. As I say, the committee met this once and it was quite obvious that we were not going to accomplish anything. When you are not accomplishing anything I think it is a little silly to continue to hold meetings.

MR. SMITH. Did you take any further action?

MR. MURPHY. Yes. With respect to the Screen Actors Guild I wanted to make sure of the feelings and the views of our membership. I think this will be of interest to the committee because it will pretty well show the actual number of Communists or Communist sympathizers or people who have been misled by the Communists.

I hope the committee realizes that in Hollywood as in every other part of the country there are an awful lot of good, honest, liberal people who are being used by the Communists and who are sometimes sucked into these things.

We called a mass meeting of the membership. We invited Mr. Herbert Sorrell, who is the head of the Conference of Studio Unions, and Mr. Richard Maltz, who is the president of the IATSE. We gave them each a half hour to state their case before our membership and then sent out a secret ballot to the membership to find out their exact wishes in the matter.

The important fact, I think, is that the ballots came back 97.3 percent not to join the strike. Based on that figure I would say we could safely put the figure of active Communists at below 1 percent in the Screen Actors Guild, because I assume, as is generally the case with those people, all of their people voted and some of ours may not have.

MR. SMITH. Did the other guilds or unions take such a vote, to your knowledge?

MR. MURPHY. As far as I know there was only one other union that took a secret ballot on the strike. I think that was the Screen Office Employees Guild. A strange thing happened with regard to it. The ballot was taken and I believe the tabulation was some 900 to 600 not to join the strike, but they were ordered to join the strike in spite of that under the threat they would lose their charter. Their charter was from the painters' union.

MR. SMITH. Were there any attempts from within the Screen Actors Guild to change the guild's policy?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; there was some disagreement, not very much. It did not amount to very much. Some people thought, and there was a great campaign put on, to the effect that we were crossing picket lines where brother unionists were out on strike. There were throw-aways which called Mr. Arnold, Mr. Reagan, and myself scabs. Actually we felt we were not going to work to take another man's job, which is what a "scab" is, I believe.

As to the people who took that position, I think some of them did it sincerely. I believe, however, there may have been a few who were taking advantage of the situation, if possible, to create greater turmoil within the industry.

Mr. SMITH. Was there any direct action taken by this minority group?

Mr. MURPHY. Well, one thing that happened at one of the later mass meetings. Late in the meeting there was a proposal from the floor, a resolution, and as I heard it read from the floor it occurred to me that, although it was very wordy and seemed a little ambiguous, that it could be construed to put us right in the middle of the strike, a position that had been directly opposed by the vote of our membership. On that basis I declared the resolution out of order. This was quite late in the meeting. As I remember, directly that I declared it out of order, this meeting was adjourned.

I think at this time possibly 40 percent of the members who had attended the meeting had gone home. It is a little difficult in Hollywood to hold meetings. The actors who are working, as most of you know, and the ladies, particularly, have to get up at 5:30 or 6 o'clock in the morning, and even a lazy fellow like myself, I have to be up at 7 o'clock. So they are inclined to leave meetings early. And, in fact, they are a little hard to get to meetings—I guess like most Americans.

Mr. SMITH. Do you know who proposed this resolution?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not. As I say, it was late in the meeting, it came from the back of the floor, and the proponent did not announce her name. It was a lady, I know that.

Mr. SMITH. As an officer and a member of the Screen Actors Guild for a number of years, to what extent has communism infiltrated into the Screen Actors Guild, in your opinion?

Mr. MURPHY. Well, in my opinion, there has been a constant irritation from a very small group. The group is constantly changing. I think that some of the members of the group have been led to believe that certain things are true that are not true. We have had experience with some of them that come up to the guild office, and after asking a few questions and seeing the records and documents have decided that they have been misled, that they have taken an erroneous position on certain things. I don't think actually, numerically, as I said before, I don't think that they amount to 1 percent of the guild membership.

Mr. SMITH. Now, you heard Mr. Montgomery's testimony regarding the resolution that was adopted, did you not?

Mr. MURPHY. I did.

Mr. SMITH. As to fascism and communism. You were there. I believe you were chairman of that particular meeting; is that correct?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, I was; I was present.

Mr. SMITH. To the best of your recollection, was his testimony correct regarding this resolution?

Mr. MURPHY. Absolutely correct.

Mr. SMITH. Do you recall any other instances where the guild has taken action to combat communism?

Mr. MURPHY. Well, one thing occurred to me. While I was president of the Screen Actors Guild the bylaws provided that 15 percent of the membership present at any meeting would constitute a quorum; a quorum making it possible for 15 percent to conduct business and to decide on policy of the Screen Actors Guild. I am a very bad mathematician, but it occurred to me that a half of 15 percent was $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent; $7\frac{1}{2}$ percent plus one vote could decide the future policy of the guild. It seemed to me that this was a very undemocratic process. There was some argument made that if people didn't have the interest enough in their organization to attend meetings that they shouldn't have a right to decide policy. I, along with many others on the board, took the position that as long as they were members in good standing, whether they attended meetings or not, for whatever meeting, that they had the same rights in the organization in deciding policy.

From this discussion the bylaws of the Screen Actors Guild were changed so that at the present time any matter of importance or any matter that pertains to the policy of the Screen Actors Guild and the affairs of the general membership there is sent by mail a ballot on it to every member in good standing of the Screen Actors Guild.

Mr. SMITH. Leaving aside for the moment the Screen Actors Guild, do you feel there is any communism in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; I think there is communism in the motion-picture industry—as there is in practically every other industry in our Nation today. I think that the screen has been very successful in keeping any attempts to propagandize off the screen. As I say, I am an actor. I am not as conversant as some others who have testified, with regard to the problems of the writers and producers and directors. I am handed a script. Once in a while I try to change a line or two or a word or two, and maybe add a dance step, but that is about the extent of my business.

However, I think there has been definite evidence that there are Communists at work in the picture industry and it seems to me that it would be absolutely consistent with the policy, that being such a means of communication. I think that they probably would be very anxious to be at work in the picture industry.

Mr. SMITH. Have you ever been called upon to give lines in a picture which you felt were communistic?

Mr. MURPHY. No; I have not.

Mr. SMITH. Supposing you were called upon to give such lines, what would be your position?

Mr. MURPHY. I am afraid, as they say in the theater, I would dry up, I wouldn't read the lines, nor would I play the part if I considered the part to be one that spread Communist propaganda.

Mr. SMITH. Do you feel that if things continue as they are the Communists might gain enough strength to control the industry?

Mr. MURPHY. There is much discussion about Communist propaganda. I think all who read the newspapers and the columns realize that the Communist Party in the past has appeared to be in no particular hurry about achieving its ends. I think to look for direct Communist propaganda in pictures at this particular moment might be a

mistake. I think we should be well on our guard that the infiltration maybe is taking place at this time so that after the infiltration has reached a saturation point later on the screen may be used in a manner inimical to the best interests of our country.

Mr. SMITH. Do you believe the Communist Party is an agency of a foreign enemy?

Mr. MURPHY. I have no way of proving this, but from the reading that I have done, and listening to the radio, I believe that the Communist Party members are agents of a foreign country.

Mr. SMITH. As stated to Mr. Montgomery by Mr. Stripling, there are two bills presently pending before this committee in regard to the Communist Party. What is your thought as to what action should be taken on those bills?

Mr. MURPHY. I think if the Government of the United States decides that the Communist Party is taking orders from a foreign government, and its members are acting as agents of a foreign government, I think they should be so labeled, and I don't think that an agent of a foreign government should be allowed to hide under the guise that he is a member of a legal American political party. I think the differentiation between the political party and the actual condition should be brought home to the American public.

No. 2, I think there are agencies of the United States Government which have much more proof, a great many more facts than we have. I think if the information obtained by those agencies were made public to the people, I think that the great American public would tell the Congress of the United States very quickly and without question what action they think should be taken.

With regard to the motion-picture industry, I would wish that there would be some attempt, and I know in the past there have been attempts, to maybe tell the American story truly in foreign countries, and I think that there is no better way to tell this story than through the motion picture. I am certain from conversations that I have had with the leaders of the industry that they would be terribly anxious to cooperate in any way. For instance, with a program that might possibly be set up with the State Department in telling the actual American story and combating such un-American propaganda as greeted me this morning when I found in the newspaper under my door at the hotel something to the effect that the Russian Government orders that all Communists should immediately go to work on the Marshall plan and see if they can't break that up.

The CHAIRMAN. Along that same line, don't you think it also advisable that the moving-picture industry produce some pictures to be shown in the United States showing the dangers of communism here?

Mr. MURPHY. I think that might be very helpful; yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Have you been smeared too, Mr. Murphy?

Mr. MURPHY. Well, during the strike there was a routine of handing out throw-aways around the studios and around town every day

and they made up three characters that were known as Ronnie, Eddie, and George—Ronald Reagan, Eddie Arnold, and George Murphy. We were on the committee that had gone back to Chicago during the strike, you see, and we were smeared, we were called "producers' men."

Mr. McDOWELL. Stooges?

Mr. MURPHY. Stooges, yes. And I think the proof of whether we were stooges or not is evidenced by the contract that the Screen Actors Guild concluded, which is the best ever concluded with the producers, and I think one of the best labor contracts ever written.

Mr. McDOWELL. You have been called a Fascist, no doubt?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes; I have been called a Fascist, but I don't pay an awful lot of attention to that. I think maybe the time has come when anybody who disagrees with a Communist is a Fascist—and I certainly disagree with a Communist.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, you have been a good witness. It is very fortunate for the American film industry, producers, actors, workers, painters, everybody else, that there has been a group of you fellows out there, men and women, who have had the courage of your convictions, and have stood up and fought. You have done a fine job.

Mr. MURPHY. If I may say so, Mr. Chairman, we had more than the courage of our convictions. We had what we knew to be the backing of the great majority of our membership, and when you are carrying out what you know to be the will of the people which you are representing you don't have much hesitancy and your way is pretty clear.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon.

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. It was very fine of you to come here today.⁸⁵

The next witness.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Ronald Reagan.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. REAGAN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. So help you God?

Mr. REAGAN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF RONALD REAGAN

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Reagan, will you please state your full name and present address?

Mr. REAGAN. Ronald Reagan, 9137 Cordell Drive, Los Angeles 46, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Reagan?

Mr. REAGAN. Tampico, Ill., February 6, 1911.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

Mr. REAGAN. Motion-picture actor.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been engaged in that profession?

Mr. REAGAN. Since June 1937 with a brief interlude of 3½ years—that at the time didn't seem very brief.

⁸⁵ See appendix, p. 531, for exhibit 48.

Mr. STRIPLING. What period was that?

Mr. REAGAN. That was during the late war.

Mr. STRIPLING. What branch of the service were you in?

Mr. REAGAN. Well, sir, I had been for several years in the Reserve as an officer in the United States Cavalry, but I was assigned to the Air Corps.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is kind of typical of the Army, isn't it?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir. The first thing the Air Corps did was loan me to the Signal Corps.

Mr. McDOWELL. You didn't wear spurs?

Mr. REAGAN. I did for a short while.

The CHAIRMAN. I think this has little to do with the facts we are seeking; proceed.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Reagan, are you a member of any guild?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir; the Screen Actors Guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a member?

Mr. REAGAN. Since June 1937.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you the president of the guild at the present time?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. When were you elected?

Mr. REAGAN. That was several months ago. I was elected to replace Mr. Montgomery when he resigned.

Mr. STRIPLING. When does your term expire?

Mr. REAGAN. The elections come up next month.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever held any other position in the Screen Actors Guild?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir. Just prior to the war I was a member of the board of directors, and just after the war, prior to my being elected president, I was a member of the board of directors.

Mr. STRIPLING. As a member of the board of directors, as president of the Screen Actors Guild, and as an active member, have you at any time observed or noted within the organization a clique of either Communists or Fascists who were attempting to exert influence or pressure on the guild?

Mr. REAGAN. Well, sir, my testimony must be very similar to that of Mr. Murphy and Mr. Montgomery. There has been a small group within the Screen Actors Guild which has consistently opposed the policy of the guild board and officers of the guild, as evidenced by the vote on various issues. That small clique referred to has been suspected of more or less following the tactics that we associate with the Communist Party.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you refer to them as a disruptive influence within the guild?

Mr. REAGAN. I would say that at times they have attempted to be a disruptive influence.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have no knowledge yourself as to whether or not any of them are members of the Communist Party?

Mr. REAGAN. No, sir; I have no investigative force, or anything, and I do not know.

Mr. STRIPLING. Has it ever been reported to you that certain members of the guild were Communists?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir; I have heard different discussions and some of them tagged as Communists.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever heard that from any reliable source?

Mr. REAGAN. Well, I considered the source as reliable at the time.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you say that this clique has attempted to dominate the guild?

Mr. REAGAN. Well, sir, by attempting to put over their own particular views on various issues, I guess in regard to that you would have to say that our side was attempting to dominate, too; because we were fighting just as hard to put over our views, in which we sincerely believed, and I think we were proven correct by the figures—Mr. Murphy gave the figures—and those figures were always approximately the same, an average of 90 percent or better of the Screen Actors Guild voted in favor of those matters now guild policy.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Reagan, there has been testimony to the effect here that numerous Communist-front organizations have been set up in Hollywood. Have you ever been solicited to join any of those organizations or any organization which you considered to be a Communist-front organization?

Mr. REAGAN. Well, sir, I have received literature from an organization called the Committee for a Far-Eastern Democratic Policy. I don't know whether it is Communist or not. I only know that I didn't like their views and as a result I didn't want to have anything to do with them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you ever solicited to sponsor the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee?

Mr. REAGAN. No, sir; I was never solicited to do that, but I found myself misled into being a sponsor on another occasion for a function that was held under the auspices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you knowingly give your name as a sponsor?

Mr. REAGAN. Not knowingly. Could I explain what that occasion was?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes, sir.

Mr. REAGAN. I was called several weeks ago. There happened at the time in Hollywood to be a financial drive on to raise money to build a badly needed hospital in a certain section of town, called the All Nations Hospital. I think the purpose of the building is so obvious by the title that it has the support of most of the people of Hollywood—or, of Los Angeles, I should say. Certainly of most of the doctors, because it is very badly needed.

Some time ago I was called to the telephone. A woman introduced herself by name. Knowing that I didn't know her I didn't make any particular note of her name and I couldn't give it now. She told me that there would be a recital held at which Paul Robeson would sing and she said that all the money for the tickets would go to the hospital and asked if she could use my name as one of the sponsors. I hesitated for a moment because I don't think that Mr. Robeson's and my political views coincide at all and then I thought I was being a little stupid because, I thought, here is an occasion where Mr. Robeson is perhaps appearing as an artist and certainly the object, raising money, is above any political consideration, it is a hospital supported by everyone. I have contributed money myself. So I felt a little bit as if I had been stuffy for a minute and I said, certainly, you can use my name.

I left town for a couple of weeks and when I returned I was handed a newspaper story that said that this recital was held at the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles under the auspices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. The principal speaker was Emil Lustig. Robert Burman took up a collection, and remnants of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were paraded to the platform. I did not in the newspaper story see one word about the hospital. I called the newspaper and said I am not accustomed to writing to editors, but would like to explain my position, and he laughed and said, "You needn't bother, you are about the fiftieth person that has called with the same idea, including most of the legitimate doctors who had also been listed as sponsors of that affair."

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you say from your observation that that is typical of the tactics or strategy of the Communists, to solicit and use the names of prominent people to either raise money or gain support?

Mr. REAGAN. I think it is in keeping with their tactics; yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think there is anything democratic about those tactics?

Mr. REAGAN. I do not, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. As president of the Screen Actors Guild you are familiar with the jurisdictional strike which has been going on in Hollywood for some time?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever had any conferences with any of the labor officials regarding this strike?

Mr. REAGAN. Yes, sir. In fact, some 14 days or so before the strike actually took place our guild, feeling that we were representing our actors to the best of our ability, and this being a situation in which the studios might be closed, we met with the producers, met with both factions in the jurisdictional dispute in an attempt to settle that strike. We continued meeting with them separately and together. I believe the Screen Actors Guild committee which put these people in one room and tried to settle the strike perhaps is better informed on the situation and on the jurisdictional strike than any other group in the motion-picture industry.

We met repeatedly and we met continuously for 7 months and then intermittently from that 7 months' period on. The strike is still continuing.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether the Communists have participated in any way in this strike?

Mr. REAGAN. Sir, the first time that this word "Communist" was ever injected into any of the meetings concerning the strike was at a meeting in Chicago with Mr. William Hutchinson, president of the carpenters union, who were on strike at the time. He asked the Screen Actors Guild to submit terms to Mr. Walsh, for Walsh to give in in the settling of this strike, and he told us to tell Mr. Walsh that if he would give in on these terms he in turn would run this Sorrell and the other Commies out—I am quoting him—and break it up. I might add that Mr. Walsh and Mr. Sorrell were running the strike for Mr. Hutchinson in Hollywood.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Reagan, what is your feeling about what steps should be taken to rid the motion-picture industry of any Communist influences, if they are there?

MR. REAGAN. Well, sir, I would like to say, as Mr. Montgomery and Mr. Murphy have indicated, they have done it very well. I have been alarmed by the misapprehension, the feeling around, that it was a minority fighting against a majority on this issue in our business, and I would like in answering that question to reiterate what those gentlemen have said, that rather 99 percent of us are pretty well aware of what is going on, and I think within the bounds of our democratic rights, and never once stepping over the rights given us by democracy, we have done a pretty good job in our business of keeping those people's activities curtailed. After all, we must recognize them at present as a political party. On that basis we have exposed their lies when we came across them, we have opposed their propaganda, and I can certainly testify that in the case of the Screen Actors Guild we have been eminently successful in preventing them from, with their usual tactics, trying to run a majority of an organization with a well organized minority.

So that fundamentally I would say in opposing those people that the best thing to do is to make democracy work. In the Screen Actors Guild we make it work by insuring everyone a vote and by keeping everyone informed. I believe that, as Thomas Jefferson put it, if all the American people know all of the facts they will never make a mistake.

Whether the party should be outlawed, I agree with the gentlemen that preceded me that that is a matter for the Government to decide. As a citizen I would hesitate, or not like, to see any political party outlawed on the basis of its political ideology. We have spent 170 years in this country on the basis that democracy is strong enough to stand up and fight against the inroads of any ideology. However, if it is proven that an organization is an agent of a power, a foreign power, or in any way not a legitimate political party, and I think the Government is capable of proving that, if the proof is there, then that is another matter.

I do not know whether I have answered your question or not. I, like Mr. Montgomery, would like at this moment to say I happen to be very proud of the industry in which I work; I happen to be very proud of the way in which we conducted the fight. I do not believe the Communists have ever at any time been able to use the motion-picture screen as a sounding board for their philosophy or ideology. I think that will continue as long the people in Hollywood continue as they are, which is alert, conscious of it, and fighting. I would also like to say that I think we can match the record of our industry in the contribution to the social welfare against that of any industry in the United States.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Reagan, you have testified here concerning the Screen Actors Guild and the record that you people have made within that guild. You are not aware, however, of the efforts which the Communists have made within the Screen Writers Guild, are you?

MR. REAGAN. Sir, like the other gentlemen, I must say that that is hearsay. I have heard discussions concerning it.

THE CHAIRMAN. I think we have had testimony with regard to the Screen Writers Guild. These people are more fully acquainted with the Screen Actors Guild.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, these three witnesses were brought here simply to testify, as president and past presidents of the Screen

Actors Guild, as to the possible infiltration within that organization. As you are aware we have heard numerous witnesses on the Screen Writers Guild. Those are all the questions I have at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood?

Mr. WOOD. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Nixon?

Mr. NIXON. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one thing that you said that interested me very much. That was the quotation from Jefferson. That is just why this committee was created by the House of Representatives, to acquaint the American people with the facts. Once the American people are acquainted with the facts there is no question but what the American people will do a job, the kind of a job that they want done; that is, to make America just as pure as we can possibly make it.

We want to thank you very much for coming here today.

Mr. REAGAN. Sir, if I might, in regard to that, say that what I was trying to express, and didn't do very well, was also this other fear. I detest, I abhor their philosophy, but I detest more than that their tactics, which are those of the fifth column, and are dishonest, but at the same time I never as a citizen want to see our country become urged, by either fear or resentment of this group, that we ever compromise with any of our democratic principles through that fear or resentment. I still think that democracy can do it.

The CHAIRMAN. We agree with that. Thank you very much.³⁶

Mr. Smith, Mr. Russell, Mr. Leckie will escort those three witnesses from the room, please, if they care to go at this time.

The Chair would like to make this announcement. The Chair would like to announce the witnesses for this afternoon. The witnesses this afternoon will be Mr. Leo McCarey and Mr. Gary Cooper. We will recess until 2 o'clock.

(Thereupon, at 12 noon, a recess was taken until 2 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. Everyone will please take their seats.

The Chair would like to announce at this time that the witnesses for tomorrow are Mrs. Lela Rogers, Mr. Roy Brewer, Mr. Walt Disney, and Mr. Oliver Carlson.

The first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, there will be two witnesses this afternoon, Mr. Gary Cooper and Mr. Leo McCarey. After that, there are some matters that may be taken up in executive session, if that is possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will meet in executive session this afternoon when the hearing is concluded to take up those matters.

Mr. Gary Cooper, will you please stand and raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

³⁶ See appendix, p. 532, for exhibit 49.

Mr. COOPER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF GARY COOPER

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cooper, will you state your full name and present address, please?

Mr. COOPER. My name is Gary Cooper; I live in Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Cooper?

Mr. COOPER. I was born in Helena, Mont., in 1901.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

Mr. COOPER. An actor.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cooper, you are here in response to a subpoena which was served upon you on September 26: are you not? ³⁷

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the interrogation of Mr. Cooper will be done by Mr. Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith. We will have more order, please.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Cooper, how long have you been an actor?

Mr. COOPER. I have been an actor since 1925.

Mr. SMITH. And how long have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. COOPER. Since 1924.

Mr. SMITH. I believe you made many pictures, some of which pictures are Unconquered, Pride of the Yankees, Saratoga Trunk, Mr. Deeds Goes to Town, and you are presently making Good Sam; is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith and Mr. Cooper, will you please speak up?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. COOPER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. Are you a member of the Screen Actors Guild?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; I have been a member since the guild was organized.

Mr. SMITH. During the time that you have been in Hollywood, have you ever observed any communistic influence in Hollywood or in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. COOPER. I believe I have noticed some.

Mr. SMITH. What do you believe the principal medium is that they use Hollywood or the industry to inject propaganda?

Mr. COOPER. Well, I believe it is done through word of mouth—

The CHAIRMAN. Will you speak louder, please, Mr. Cooper?

Mr. COOPER. I believe it is done through word of mouth and through the medium of pamphletting—and writers, I suppose.

Mr. SMITH. By word of mouth, what do you mean, Mr. Cooper?

Mr. COOPER. Well, I mean sort of social gatherings.

Mr. SMITH. That has been your observation?

Mr. COOPER. That has been my only observation; yes.

Mr. SMITH. Can you tell us some of the statements that you may have heard at these gatherings that you believe are communistic?

Mr. COOPER. Well, I have heard quite a few, I think, from time to time over the years. Well, I have heard tossed around such state-

³⁷ See appendix, p. 532, for exhibit 50.

ments as, "Don't you think the Constitution of the United States is about 150 years out of date?" and—oh, I don't know—I have heard people mention that, well, "Perhaps this would be a more efficient Government without a Congress"—which statements I think are very un-American.

MR. SMITH. Have you ever observed any communistic information in any scripts?

MR. COOPER. Well, I have turned down quite a few scripts because I thought they were tinged with communistic ideas.

MR. SMITH. Can you name any of those scripts?

MR. COOPER. No; I can't recall any of those scripts to mind.

MR. SMITH. Can you tell us—

MR. COOPER. The titles.

THE CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Mr. Cooper, you haven't got that bad a memory.

MR. COOPER. I beg your pardon, sir?

THE CHAIRMAN. I say, you haven't got that bad a memory, have you? You must be able to remember some of those scripts you turned down because you thought they were Communist scripts.

MR. COOPER. Well, I can't actually give you a title to any of them; no.

THE CHAIRMAN. Will you think it over, then, and supply the committee with a list of those scripts?

MR. COOPER. I don't think I could, because most of the scripts I read at night, and if they don't look good to me I don't finish them or if I do finish them I send them back as soon as possible to their author.

THE CHAIRMAN. I understand. I didn't understand you before. Go ahead.

MR. McDOWELL. That is the custom of most actors, most stars, Mr. Cooper?

MR. COOPER. Yes, I believe so; yes sir. As to the material, which is more important than the name of the script, I did turn back one script because the leading character in the play was a man whose life's ambition was to organize an army in the United States, an army of soldiers who would never fight to defend their country. I don't remember any more details of the play, but that was enough of a basic idea for me to send it back quickly to its author.

MR. SMITH. Mr. Cooper, have you ever had any personal experience where you feel the Communist Party may have attempted to use you?

MR. COOPER. They haven't attempted to use me, I don't think, because, apparently, they know that I am not very sympathetic to communism. Several years ago, when communism was more of a social chit-chat in parties for offices, and so on, when communism didn't have the implications that it has now, discussion of communism was more open and I remember hearing statements from some folks to the effect that the communistic system had a great many features that were desirable, one of which would be desirable to us in the motion-picture business in that it offered the actors and artists—in other words, the creative people—a special place in Government where we would be somewhat immune from the ordinary leveling of income. And as I remember, some actor's name was mentioned to me who had

a house in Moscow which was very large—he had three cars, and stuff, with his house being quite a bit larger than my house in Beverly Hills at the time—and it looked to me like a pretty phony come-on to us in the picture business. From that time on, I could never take any of this pinko mouthing very seriously, because I didn't feel it was on the level.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, we have several official documents that we have obtained through the State Department, which I believe clearly shows that the Communist Party attempts to use actors individually throughout the world to further their cause. With your permission, I would like to show one of these documents to Mr. Cooper and have him read it to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. SMITH. I would like to have you glance at this document, Mr. Cooper, and read to the committee from this document.

Mr. COOPER. Ahem—

Mr. SMITH. Just one moment, please, Mr. Cooper. This document from which Mr. Cooper is going to read was distributed in pamphlets in Italy during May of 1947.³⁸

Mr. COOPER. Shall I read it?

Mr. SMITH. By the Communist Party. Yes, sir; go ahead.

Mr. COOPER (reading) :

Gary Cooper, who took part in the fights for the independence of Spain, held a speech before a crowd of 90,000 in Philadelphia on the occasion of the consecration of the banner of the Philadelphia Communist Federation.

Between other things, he said: "In our days it is the greatest honor to be a Communist. I wish the whole world to understand what we Communists really are. There could be nobody then who might say that we are enemies of mankind and peace. Those who want to discuss Communist ideas should first get to know them. Americans learn this with great difficulty. Millions of people from other continents regard America as a center of modern civilization, but only we Americans can see how false this opinion is. Let us be frank. Our country is a country of gold, silver, petrol, and great railways. But at the same time it is a country where Rockefeller, Ford, and Rothschild use tear gas against striking workers fighting for their legitimate rights. Our country is the fatherland of Lincoln and Roosevelt, but at the same time it is a country of men like Senator Bilbo and many of his type. It is a country where redskins were exterminated by arms and brandy."

Mr. SMITH. Have you any comment on that, Mr. Cooper?

Mr. COOPER. Well, sir—

The CHAIRMAN. Excuse me a minute. Mr. Smith, you say this letter was distributed by the Communist Party in Italy?

Mr. SMITH. In May of 1947, Mr. Chairman; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And we got the letter from the State Department?

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed, Mr. Cooper.

Mr. SMITH. Were you ever in Philadelphia, Mr. Cooper?

Mr. COOPER. No, sir; I was never in Philadelphia.

Mr. SMITH. Do you have any comment to make regarding this letter?

Mr. COOPER. Well, a 90,000 audience is a little tough to disregard, but it is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to help you along, Mr. Cooper—

Mr. COOPER. No part of it is true, sir.

³⁸ See appendix, p. 532, for exhibit 51.

The CHAIRMAN. I happen to know it is just a plain, ordinary, ruthless lie. We know that for a fact. So you don't have to worry any more about that.

Mr. McDOWELL. And also, Mr. Cooper, in order to get it into the record, don't you think there wouldn't be 90,000 people in Philadelphia who were Communists?

Mr. COOPER. Well, I believe it was Mr. Smith here that said you would have a hard time getting 90,000 people out in Philadelphia for anything. I don't know about that.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have in my possession another similar document which I believe should be read, some portions of it should be read into the record. It was distributed on Saturday, July 19, 1947, by the Communist Party in Yugoslavia, in various cities therein, and with your permission I would like to read a few paragraphs therefrom.³⁹

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. SMITH (reading):

In the usual column on the sixth page entitled "Fascist Shooting on Broadway," appeared the following:

"In the middle of June, in Hollywood, Gary Cooper, Tyrone Power, and Alan Ladd, well-known film stars, were imprisoned because they were marked as leftists and denounced un-Americans, but before that happened, something else was going on, about which the American newspaper agencies did not speak, and that is very characteristic of conditions today in the United States.

"The film actor, Buster Crabbe, lost his life in a mysterious way. The background of this tragic and mysterious death of Buster Crabbe was set forth by the New York paper, Red Star. From the articles of Immy Stendaph, we can see that Buster Crabbe was very popular in the United States. He organized a movement in the Army to protest against the investigation of un-American activities against Cooper, Chaplin, and other film stars.

"The beginning of Buster Crabbe's tragedy was when he found valuable documents, through which documents he could give light and prove the criminal and aggressive plans of reactionary circles in America.

"* * * On May 31, Buster Crabbe came to the apartment of the well-known film actor, Spencer Tracy, also well-known as a leftist and they had a long talk in the presence of Tyrone Power.

"* * * On June 3, on Broadway, on the corner of Seventh Avenue, Crabbe was riddled with bullets from a machine gun from a closed car. This tragic death of Crabbe, provoked terrific unrest in Hollywood. At the funeral of Buster Crabbe, 150,000 men were present, and the coffin was carried by Comrades Gary Cooper, Tyrone Power"—

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think we will have to have any more of that letter. But what I would like to have you do, Mr. Smith, is to identify, clearly identify the source.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, sir; there is just one more paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, read on, if you want to.

Mr. SMITH (reading):

This case is very characteristic of the conditions which are now prevailing in the United States. This is the method of Fascist liquidation which this country of freedom and democracy is dealing with a political opponent. It is quite possible that this crime was committed by the KKK and inspired by the elements who were interested in Crabbe's disappearance—that he stop talking.

My point, Mr. Chairman, is to show not only in Hollywood, but throughout the world the extent to which the Communist Party can go to use an actor to further their cause. This particular document was distributed by the Communist Party in July 1947 in Yugoslavia.

³⁹ See appendix, p. 532, for exhibit 52.

We have the official copy from the State Department for introduction into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you see from that, Mr. Cooper, to what extent they will go.

Mr. COOPER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So when they used your name in that regard you can almost consider it a compliment.

Mr. COOPER. Thank you.

Mr. McDOWELL. May I ask, Mr. Chairman, if Crabbe is living? Is Mr. Crabbe living?

Mr. SMITH. So far as I know, he is living.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Crabbe is a very healthy specimen of American manhood.

Mr. SMITH. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wood.

Mr. WOOD. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cooper, witnesses who have preceded you from Hollywood have said that they consider members of the Communist Party to be agents of a foreign government. Do you consider the members of the Communist Party to be that?

Mr. COOPER. I am not in nearly as good a position to know as some of the witnesses that have been ahead of me, because I am not a very active member in our guild. They, therefore, know much more about the politics and the workings of what Communists there are in the guild than I. From the general, over-all things that you hear in Hollywood, I would assume that there is such a close parallel and I think this document which Mr. Smith gave me is a pretty good indication that there is a direct connection in the material that comes from abroad and the material that is given to them here.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think that the Communist group or clique in Hollywood, whether it is in the Screen Actors Guild or the Screen Writers Guild, is a good influence or bad influence for the motion pictures generally?

Mr. COOPER. Well, to go back to one or two examples that I quoted before, I think it is a very bad influence because it is very un-American. I mean, it is very shocking to hear someone with a lot of money say such a thing as, "The Constitution of the United States is 150 years out of date."

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever been solicited to join the Communist Party or any of its fronts, Mr. Cooper?

Mr. COOPER. No, I have not.

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Cooper, during the wartime, the moving-picture industry made anti-Nazi films. Don't you think it would be a good idea if now the moving-picture industry produced anti-Communist films showing the dangers from communism in the United States?

Mr. COOPER. Well, I don't think it is a bad idea, that the public should be informed of what activity there is in the motion-picture busi-

ness toward communism. As little or as great as it may be, I don't think it is a good thing. It is not good for those people that even believe in it. I think some very sound—as I suggested before—and real fine pictures, more of them, should be made on selling what is really Americanism. A great many good pictures have been made, and I have tried to do some of them, but I think there is great room for reselling people the idea of what we have got in this country, which is the finest thing there is in the world. I know that the great majority of people in Hollywood and certainly the great majority of people in this country would not exchange our country or government for any other.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you one more question. Do you think that communism is on the increase or on the decrease out in Hollywood?

Mr. COOPER. It is very difficult to say right now, within these last few months, because it has become unpopular and a little risky to say too much. You notice the difference. People who were quite easy to express their thoughts before begin to clam up more than they used to.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, some of them are "getting religion"?

Mr. COOPER. Well, I don't know, but they do their discussions in corners, I guess, in huddles of their own where they are surrounded with their own.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you heard about these bills that are before the Un-American Activities Committee, bills to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States, just as the Communist Party is outlawed in Canada and the Communist Party is outlawed in some South American countries.

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe as a prominent person in your field that it would be wise for us, the Congress, to pass legislation to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. COOPER. I think it would be a good idea, although I have never read Karl Marx and I don't know the basis of communism, beyond what I have picked up from hearsay. From what I hear, I don't like it because it isn't on the level. So I couldn't possibly answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other member have any questions?

(No response.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith, do you have any more questions?

Mr. SMITH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. No more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Cooper, thanks very much for coming here today. We hope we didn't put you out too much.

Mr. COOPER. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. COOPER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. And, Mr. Cooper, if you will just stay over there, or if you want to leave. It is up to you.

Mr. COOPER. I would like to wait.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the next witness is Mr. Leo McCarey.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McCarey. Raise your right hand, Mr. McCarey.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. McCAREY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down. May we have order.

TESTIMONY OF LEO McCAREY

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. McCarey, will you state your full name and present address, please?

Mr. McCAREY. Leo McCarey, 1018 Ocean Front, Santa Monica, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. McCAREY. I was born in Los Angeles in 1896.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation, Mr. McCarey?

Mr. McCAREY. Motion-picture director.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a director?

Mr. McCAREY. Since 1923, I think.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you held any other positions in Hollywood? Have you been an actor or writer?

Mr. McCAREY. I have written a bit, and at one time I was vice president of the Hal Roach Studio.

Mr. STRIPLING. What are some of the pictures which you have directed and produced?

Mr. McCAREY. Ruggles of Red Gap, the Awful Truth, Love Affair, Going My Way, and the Bells of St. Marys.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were Going My Way and the Bells of St. Marys two of the most popular pictures which you have produced in recent years, according to the box office?

Mr. McCAREY. According to the box office, they were both very successful.

Mr. STRIPLING. They did very well?

Mr. McCAREY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. How did they do in Russia?

Mr. McCAREY. We haven't received one ruble from Russia on either picture.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is the trouble?

Mr. McCAREY. Well, I think I have a character in there that they do not like.

Mr. STRIPLING. Bing Crosby?

Mr. McCAREY. No; God.

Mr. STRIPLING. Wasn't Bing Crosby the star in both of those pictures?

Mr. McCAREY. He was the star in both pictures; yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Since you have been in Hollywood, Mr. McCarey, have you noticed the activities of the Communists in any particular group there?

Mr. McCAREY. Yes, I have, particularly in the writers' group.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is that the principal medium through which the Communists have sought to inject their propaganda or un-American ideas?

Mr. McCAREY. Well, naturally, it is the most efficient way to get over what they want to say; yes. There are several other angles, too, in the suppression of ideas that are pro-American. Many a script

never sees the light of day because it is rejected before we ever get to read it.

Also in the casting of pictures. The dialogue in the script could be ostensibly quite innocuous but they can cast a character so repulsive when you take one look at him you don't like the man who is portrayed as a capitalist, a banker, or whatever part he is portraying.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think the Communists have been successful in the past 10 years in injecting any propaganda into pictures?

Mr. McCAREY. They have been successful in injecting propaganda but fortunately very few pictures with Communist propaganda have made any money. They have been quite unsuccessful, and I am very happy that the American public just does not patronize them.

Mr. STRIPLING. As a director, Mr. McCarey, what do you think the dangers are of permitting pictures to be made in which the institutions in this country are portrayed in a disparaging light? In other words, if pictures are made which always have the banker as a heavy, as it has been referred to in the testimony, and that picture is shown in foreign countries, Europe, and so on, what do you think the ultimate effect would be?

Mr. McCAREY. Well, naturally, it would give a very unfavorable opinion of people who are successful in the United States.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think that is a dangerous practice for the motion pictures to pursue?

Mr. McCAREY. I think it is a very dangerous practice.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think the Communist influence in Hollywood has increased or decreased within the past 3 years?

Mr. McCAREY. Well, I think it has been increasing until recently. I think it is getting a bit unpopular now.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever had any personal encounter with any Communist writers who have sought to place propaganda in pictures which you were directing?

Mr. McCAREY. Yes, I have.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you detail that instance to the committee?

Mr. McCAREY. I have had many experiences where ideas were suggested by myself and they would throw cold water on them if they did not agree with their own policy. They were always submitting books for me to read and I always had to be on the alert to find the latent Communist propaganda in the stories they had me read.

Mr. STRIPLING. It is very subtle, in other words?

Mr. McCAREY. At times very subtle, yes. Some of them are very clever.

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McCarey, I would like to ask you one or two questions.

Mr. McCAREY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You heard the testimony of the preceding witness concerning whether or not we should make anti-Communist films, just as we made anti-Nazi films during the war?

Mr. McCAREY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe the industry should produce anti-Communist films in order to show the American people the dangers and the intrigue of the Communist Party here in the United States?

Mr. McCAREY. Well, Mr. Thomas, that is quite a question. I think basically the screen—I like to feel it is an art. I don't think pictures should be made that have much more than what the medium stands for. It is a great art. Pictures should be entertainment. I think that because of the number of people in all lands who see our pictures. I believe it only tends toward causing more enmity if we are partisan and take any sides in our pictures.

For instance, Mr. Disney with his Donald Duck. Donald Duck is a great hero. The Three Little Pigs was very successful and the world is trying to tell us they want entertainment on the screen.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you believe we would be doing the same thing—

Mr. McCAREY. We would bring on more bitterness, I think.

The CHAIRMAN. We would be doing the same thing Soviet Russia is doing?

Mr. McCAREY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The other question is with reference to outlawing the Communist Party. We have two bills before our committee, either one of which if passed would outlaw the Communist Party in the United States just the same as it is outlawed in Canada and outlawed in some South American countries.

As one of the leaders or spokesmen of your profession, spokesman for a great many people, do you believe the Congress should outlaw the Communist Party in the United States?

Mr. McCAREY. I definitely do because I feel the party is not an American party. I think that within the confines of the United States we can have all the parties we want and have healthy debate on any subject for the betterment of all peoples but I don't think we should aline ourselves with any foreign party.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, you think an American Communist is the agent of a foreign government?

Mr. McCAREY. I definitely do and I hope something is done about it because at this time it is a very dangerous thing. It seems like in a way some people accuse us of being afraid of mentioning names. I would be very happy to mention names if we had a law with some teeth in it so that under the heading of—call it what you will; I am not a legislator and I am not a law maker—but somewhere along the line under the subdivision of "Treason," subdivision "D," or something like that, should label these people as truly un-American.

The CHAIRMAN. So that if there was a law on the books making the Communist Party illegal you would not hesitate to name the persons whom you know and believe to be Communists?

Mr. McCAREY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any more questions, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. No more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. McCarey.⁴⁰

We will adjourn until tomorrow at 10:30 a. m.

(Whereupon, at 2:35 p. m., an adjournment was taken until Friday, October 24, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.)

⁴⁰ See appendix, p. 233, for exhibit 53.

HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE-INDUSTRY

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

The record will show that a subcommittee is sitting consisting of Mr. McDowell and Mr. Thomas.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator, Messrs. Louis J. Russell, Robert B. Gaston, H. A. Smith, investigators, and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

Mrs. Rogers, will you please stand and raise your right hand?

Mrs. Rogers, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you shall give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mrs. ROGERS. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF MRS. LELA E. ROGERS

Mr. STRIPLING. Mrs. Rogers, will you please state your full name and your present address?

Mrs. ROGERS. Lela E. Rogers, 5930 Franklin Avenue, Hollywood, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where were you born?

Mrs. ROGERS. In Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mrs. ROGERS. I am the manager of my daughter's affairs and a writer of sorts.

Mr. STRIPLING. Your daughter is Ginger Rogers?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you lived in Hollywood?

Mrs. ROGERS. I entered the motion-picture business in Hollywood in 1916 as a writer. I went away from there for some time and then came back again in 1930 with my daughter.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you outline to the committee the various positions that you have held in the motion-picture industry over the years?

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Rogers testified before the committee in May in Los Angeles and she will refer to her previous testimony to refresh her memory.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. May I interrupt? I want the record to show that Mr. Vail is present.

Mr. STRIPLING. Go right ahead, please.

Mrs. ROGERS. At times I have been a theatrical coach. At one time, about 1933 to 1935, I had my own theater, the Hollytown, in Hollywood. Then from 1935 until 1938 I was dramatic coach at R-K-O Studios with my theater on the lot. Then I went to work at R-K-O Studios as assistant to the vice president in charge of production, the late Charles Kerner, in 1943. My duties were to help him with the enormous amount of reading it was necessary for him to do personally and to report my opinion of the properties under consideration for purchase and to bring other properties to his attention. I was also to suggest and recommend writers for script work.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you identify Mr. Charles Kerner for the committee?

Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Charles Kerner was at that time the vice president in charge of productions of R-K-O Studios.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mrs. Rogers, are you a member of the Motion Picture Alliance for the Preservation of American Ideals?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you one of the original members?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee why this organization was formed?

Mrs. ROGERS. The organization was formed in an attempt to combat the threat and the menace that we saw arising in Hollywood, the Communist infiltration in Hollywood in our unions and the guilds, and in our scripts and stories and direction and all avenues and all departments of the motion-picture industry. We felt that if we could bring this to the attention of the men in power, who had the right to hire and fire these people, and try to show them what these people were doing to their industry, that we could possibly save them from what we saw ahead, it would have to come out into the open and be dealt with summarily as is now being done.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think the alliance has done effective work since its formation?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir. I feel that the alliance has been right effective in that it has brought out the menace so that it could be looked at by other members of the industry, so that they would recognize it and feel it, and then learn what it was and how it worked.

Mr. STRIPLING. At the time of the formation of the alliance is it your opinion that there was a definite need for it to combat the inroads of communism within the motion-picture industry?

Mrs. ROGERS. There was a definite need. That so many important people in the industry should come together for the one purpose—

The CHAIRMAN. Will you speak louder, please?

Mrs. ROGERS. That so many people of the industry should come together for the one purpose, all of one mind, signifies to me that there was a definite need for it felt by many important people.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sam Wood, who was the first president of the alliance, testified early in the week as to the aims and purposes of the alliance and they were put into the record.

Mrs. Rogers, while you were employed as assistant to Mr. Kerner at R-K-O was it part of your duties to examine certain scripts or

stories and to recommend to him whether or not they should be considered for the possible production of a picture?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes; that was mostly my entire duty.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell this committee whether or not you ever reviewed the book *None but the Lonely Heart*, which was written by Richard Lewellyn?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir, I did. It was in the early part of 1944. Mr. Kerner handed me a book entitled, "*None but the Lonely Heart*," by Richard Lewellyn. He wanted me to read it and give an immediate report on it. It seems that Cary Grant had called from Columbia Studio to say that the book had been called to his attention by someone at Columbia who recommended it as a good story for him, Mr. Grant. Mr. Grant had not read the book. He wanted R-K-O to read it and if they found it suitable to him he wanted R-K-O to buy it and he would make it there. I found I couldn't recommend the book and said so. It was a story filled with despair and hopelessness and in my opinion was not a Cary Grant vehicle. When I finished stating my views to Mr. Kerner he told me he had bought it only a half hour before. A few days later I was present at a meeting where Mr. David Hempstead, who had been producer on the picture—

The CHAIRMAN. What was that name, Mrs. Rogers?

Mrs. ROGERS. David Hempstead. He had been made producer on the picture. He reported that he had just talked to Mr. Clifford Odets in New York and that Mr. Odets would come out to the studio and do the screen play on the story. I protested this very vehemently.

My objection to Mr. Odets as a writer was that for years I had heard that Mr. Odets was a Communist. I warned that the story lent itself to propaganda, particularly in the hands of a Communist. During the preparation for the production Mr. Odets was made director as well as writer and as the picture progressed I heard that Hanns Eisler had been employed to do the musical score for the picture.

Mr. STRIPLING. If I may interrupt at this point, Mrs. Rogers.

Mr. Chairman, Hanns Eisler testified that he did do the background music for the picture, *None but the Lonely Heart*.

Mrs. Rogers, you stated that you had heard that Clifford Odets was a Communist. What do you base that upon?

Mrs. ROGERS. I have here a column of Mr. O. O. McIntyre, dated January 8, 1936, in which Mr. McIntyre says Mr. Clifford Odets, play writer, is a member of the Communist Party. I never saw that denied.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you aware of certain sworn testimony taken by the State Committee of California on Subversive Activities?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. To the effect that Mr. Odets was a member of the Communist Party?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I might state that the committee has a voluminous record of Mr. Clifford Odets and his activities. As you are well aware, he is one of the 79 that you referred to, and his record will be taken up next week.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. You stated that Mr. Odets besides writing the script for this picture was later chosen as the director for it?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you tell us whether or not the picture was a success?

Mrs. ROGERS. The picture was not a success at the box office, though I think it returned its cost.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not Mr. Odets was successful in injecting any propaganda into the film?

Mrs. ROGERS. I have here under date line of October 2, 1944, a copy of the Hollywood Reporter with a review of *None But the Lonely Heart*. The Hollywood Reporter is a Hollywood trade paper. I will read the criticism that I read at that time:

The story, pitched in a low key, is moody and somber throughout, in the Russian manner and plods inexorably to its gloomy ending with only slight redemption in the ray of hope expressed in one of the final speeches. For the most part it moves slowly and takes time out for a bit of propaganda preachment whenever Director Clifford Odets, who also wrote the script for the Richard Lewellyn novel, felt the urge.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you say that was a typical example of how a Communist would be successful in injecting propaganda? They refer there—they use the language, I believe, “propaganda preachment.”

Mrs. ROGERS. That is right. I think that this is a splendid example, this picture, of what type of propaganda Communists like to inject in motion pictures.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell us how long Mr. Odets remained with R-K-O?

Mrs. ROGERS. Well, not long after this picture was released Mr. Odets was made a producer at R-K-O. How long he remained I do not know because I severed my connections with R-K-O in 1945, September sometime.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not Mr. Odets went to Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer from R-K-O?

Mrs. ROGERS. I think I heard he did, but as to that I would not know myself.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mrs. Rogers, there has been considerable testimony here to the effect that it is through the script writers that the Communists have been most successful in their attempts to inject Communist propaganda in films. Do you think that is a correct analysis of the situation?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes; I think the Communist gets his best work in in the field of writing.

Mr. STRIPLING. What responsibility do you think should rest with the film executives of the producers regarding the Communist influence that we now find present in the motion-picture industry? Do you think the primary responsibility should rest with them for permitting these people to be there, to infiltrate into the industry?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes; I think it must rest with them, the final decision about it. Our producing executives are good Americans and by utilizing the free-enterprise system of the United States they have built the motion-picture industry up to where it is now, the fourth largest industry in the world. They are businessmen; they are not politicians. Some of our executives have been received by the party liners they hired. As a free people we had no experience with such intrigue and conspiracy. Our executives were no more asleep than were our people or our Government or the whole world, in fact. The Communist is a

trained propagandist, highly disciplined, as is revealed by the testimony of former Soviet officials and ex-members of the Communist Party. His ways are devious and not easy to follow. I think that once our executives see this, and know it for what it is, they will be most happy to clean it out of their pictures.

In the first place, there have been very few pictures ever made with Communist propaganda in them that were successes at the box office. I feel it has a great deal to do with the dearth of good pictures today.

MR. STRIPLING. Mrs. Rogers, Mr. Robert Taylor, and Mr. Robert Montgomery, among others, have testified that they would not act in a cast or picture in which Communists were in the cast, or in which Communist lines were written into the script. As your daughter's manager, so to speak, have you and your daughter ever objected to or turned down scripts because you felt that there were lines in there for her to speak which you felt were un-American or Communist propaganda?

MRS. ROGERS. Many times.

MR. STRIPLING. You have turned down many scripts for these reasons?

MRS. ROGERS. Yes, sir. We turned down *Sister Carrie*, by Theodore Dreiser, because it was just as open propaganda as *None But the Lonely Heart*.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, Mr. Vail will act as chairman.

MR. STRIPLING. Yes, sir.

MRS. ROGERS. That is a right or a privilege, however, which only top stars can enjoy? The average actor, or person, in Hollywood, is not permitted to say what he or she will say? Is that true?

MRS. ROGERS. Well, that is true, mostly—and also for economic reasons. Most of the character players must have the work to keep going. But most of the people of Hollywood would not know a line of propaganda if they saw it. They will feel unhappy with it, just as the audience feels unhappy when they hear it, but they are not acquainted with the subject, they haven't made a study of it as some of us have, and therefore they will say lines and then afterward say, "What did I do? I didn't like that, but I did it," and are surprised to learn that they have put out a propaganda, Communist propaganda line. The star does not make a picture if he doesn't want to. He can turn it down with no explanation whatsoever. The character player just can't do that.

MR. STRIPLING. Mrs. Rogers, as one who has observed very carefully the infiltration of the Communists and watched their activities, what recommendations could you make to the committee as to how it could best be cleaned up so far as the motion-picture industry is concerned?

MRS. ROGERS. Well, I would suggest that the Congress of the United States immediately enact such legislation as will preserve the Bill of Rights to the people for whom it was designed. That precious bill was never intended to protect enemy agents, saboteurs, and spies, whether they are American or foreign born.

MR. STRIPLING. Would you favor the outlawing of the Communist Party?

MRS. ROGERS. I favor the outlawing of the Communist Party as an agency of a foreign government.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you consider them to be agents of a foreign government?

Mrs. ROGERS. I do, sir; yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, those are all the questions I have at this time.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. McDowell, any questions?

Mr. McDOWELL. Mrs. Rogers, you have devoted many years to the reading of manuscripts and the study of pictures in general. You make the statement here that there was Communist propaganda, as you detected it, in this film *None But the Lonely Heart*. I haven't heard any description of Communist propaganda in these films yet except that a banker was shown occasionally as being a no-good, and so forth. Well, of course, I know many fine bankers, many patriotic men. I also know some stinkers that should have been in jail 30 years ago. That doesn't necessarily constitute the Communist propaganda. What would describe in this film as being Communist propaganda?

Mrs. ROGERS. In *None But the Lonely Heart*?

Mr. McDOWELL. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS. I can't quote the lines of the play exactly but I can give you the sense of them. There is one place in which—it is unfair, may I say, to take a scene from its context and try to make it sound like Communist propaganda, because a Communist is very careful, very clever, and very devious in the way he sets the film. If I were to give you a line from that play straight out you would say "What is wrong with that line?" unless you knew that the Communist is trying in every way to tear down our free-enterprise system, to make the people lose faith in it, so that they will want to get something else—and the Communists have it waiting for them.

I will tell you of one line. The mother in the story runs a second-hand store. The son says to her, "You are not going to"—in essence, I am not quoting this exactly because I can't remember it exactly—he said to her, "You are not going to get me to work here and squeeze pennies out of little people poorer than I am."

Now, laid upon the background of—that is the free-enterprise system—trade, and we don't necessarily squeeze pennies from people poorer than we are. Many people are poorer and many people are richer.

As I say, you find yourself in an awful hole the moment you start to remove one of the scenes from its context.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, unfortunately for an intelligent discussion, I didn't see the picture, so I am at a complete loss. In the matter of the Hanns Eisler background music, I would judge after hearing you, both here and in California, that you would conclude that would contribute nothing to the Communist text of the film?

Mrs. ROGERS. No; I do not think that that would; no. It only shows that when a Communist secures a firm footing in a picture he surrounds himself with other Communists.

Mr. McDOWELL. Thank you, Mrs. Rogers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. Mrs. Rogers, in your opinion what percentage of the actors in the film industry are communistically inclined?

Mrs. ROGERS. I wouldn't be able to tell you in exact percentages. It is very small, I can assure you of that. But it is getting bigger. The Communist Party protects those people. They bring them out and smack them right into stardom and keep them there—the Com-

munists in key positions in Hollywood and those who have confidence of the producers.

Mr. VAIL. We had before us yesterday several prominent screen actors who gave it as their opinion that less than 1 percent of the actors were associated with communistic activities. Do you think that is a fair estimate?

Mrs. ROGERS. I think that is a fair estimate when you realize how many actors there really are in Hollywood.

Mr. VAIL. Would you be able to make an estimate of the percentage of those communistically inclined among the screen writers?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes. That is a very small percentage too, but may I, in explanation, say that Communists do not have anywhere and do not want numerical superiority. They do not want you to become a member of the Communist Party. They want a small and effective, highly trained and highly disciplined cell, and they will take care of the rest of us in their own way. There are around 200,000,000 in Russia but there are only about 2,000,000 Communists in Russia.

Mr. VAIL. But, in other words, to be effective on the Hollywood scene wouldn't you imagine that they would have to have greater numerical strength, greater than 1 percent?

Mrs. ROGERS. You are thinking like an American, sir.

Mr. VAIL. That is the way I like to think.

Mrs. ROGERS. That is right, and you should, and that is why it is so hard for the American to understand. They want a highly trained cell and they will influence you and everyone around you. They are taught in their own schools to do it. They hold schools to do it. They have the teachers to teach you to do it. Out of those they classify their students into those that can be trusted with discipline and those that are stooges, fellow travelers, and who can be trusted to carry out orders up to a certain point.

No; they do not want all of us to be Communists. You do not see in a picture Mr. Stalin's picture, in a motion picture, or anything that tries to make you a member of the Communist Party. If you did the American public would throw eggs at it and laugh it off the screen. It has to be a slow softening-up process at the present time and that must be kept in the hands of a small and well-trained cell, sometimes only three in a large union.

Mr. VAIL. Well, I was impressed with the fact that there must have been some numerical strength in the Screen Writers' Guild when it became necessary for a number of the writers to resign from the organization and establish a new organization.

Mrs. ROGERS. No. I am not a member of the Screen Writers' Guild but I believe there are around 900 members and I don't believe there are over 80 or 90 Communists or even fellow travelers in it. I mean people that agree with them and follow their dictation. I don't believe there are more than that in it. It doesn't need more than that. In fact, eight of them could run it if they get on the board.

Mr. VAIL. In other words, what they lack in numerical strength they make up in the cleverness of their maneuvers?

Mrs. ROGERS. They do not want ever numerical strength. They don't want it here in the United States. They don't want us to be Communists. They want to just run us.

Mr. VAIL. We have pending before the committee as you may be aware, Mrs. Rogers, several bills providing for legislation to outlaw

communism. From what you have said this morning I take it that you favor such legislation?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAUL. Thank you very much, Mrs. Rogers.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Rogers, do you believe the Communist influence in Hollywood is increasing or decreasing?

Mrs. ROGERS. I think their activities are increasing. I think it has had a great check put on it by those of us who recognized it long ago. I feel we have held it in check by exposing it. I know what it would be like if we had not. I know what it would look like now with the start that they had. But in exposing, you see, when the American people find out you have got your battle about half won, or maybe more than that. But the American people, they think that a Communist is a man with bushy eyebrows and a great huge Russian beard. They can't believe that they could be American citizens. I can't believe it myself. I don't understand it. But they are—and pretty, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Why are some of the persons in Hollywood who have been very successful in their lives, writers, actors, businessmen; why would they follow the Communist line?

Mrs. ROGERS. I have often asked myself that. When a man sits alone with his soul and sees what we have in America, and if he is an intelligent man he has looked around to the rest of the world and has seen the condition that the rest of the world is in, under their forms of government, I often wonder what in the world he is thinking about. What have the Communists got that he wants? The only thing I can think of is that he must want advantage of some sort, that he must believe that he is especially appointed, and that the world will make him a god—or a commissar, let us say, which is the same thing in their language. I can't understand that quirk of mind myself.

The CHAIRMAN. You believe then that by exposing communism, by aiding to educate the American people as to the dangers of communism, that we will do more that way to destroy their influence than any other way?

Mrs. ROGERS. Well, I have always said that if a banker was going to break in a new teller he wouldn't take him down in the basement and show him 99,000,000 kinds of counterfeits that have been offered to the bank, but would show him the real thing and then anything they devised is no good, is counterfeit, and I think that if we will restate American principles, and the application of those principles to present-day life, we have got them nailed to the mast.

I think that that is the reason they have been able to make the inroads that they have now, because it has been so long since our children have had this instilled in their schools. Remember, Communists are in control of many of the schools, your clubs, your study clubs, even the little women's clubs, where women come to read books to them and explain plays to them. Communists have their cohorts that do the reading and choosing of the books—and the leftist book always got by beautifully. It has been a long time since we have had the feeling that we have a clear school, that our children are being taught about America. I think that when we show the people America, as against the face of this thing, we have just about licked it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, can't the moving-picture industry aid in that to a great extent?

Mrs. ROGERS. Oh, immeasurably, but it has been a long time since you could get a good American story bought in the motion-picture industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you noticed any change in that regard in the last 6 months?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes; I think the feeling is beginning to change. I think it is. I think it looks very hopeful. I think the lefty now has been brought out in his true colors and I think the executive is going to be afraid of him from now on.

The CHAIRMAN. Then these stories to the effect that the hearings currently being held by the Un-American Activities Committee are harming the industry or might harm the industry; do you believe that to be true?

Mrs. ROGERS. I do not. I do not believe that to be true. I do not believe that anything that could happen with our Government could hurt our industry. I never want to see the motion-picture industry controlled—no more than any other industry, except those basic laws that control every industry. I want to see it free to make what it wants to make, but I want to have it stay within the truth, instead of these lies we have been told.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Rogers, what can we do to wake up the industry to produce more really American pictures?

Mrs. ROGERS. I think you are doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. You think we are doing it?

Mrs. ROGERS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be said for the record, and particularly for the benefit of the representatives of the press here and the American people, that Mrs. Lela Rogers is not merely a disturbed lady who in the course of her activities in Hollywood has stumbled across the fingers of this conspiracy against the American Government, but that long ago she discovered it and that she has become, in my opinion, one of the outstanding experts on communism in the United States, and particularly in the amusement industry. Her opinions are those gathered over many years. I think the American people should know that and know that she is lending her great talents in the general fight against it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. No more questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Rogers, and we certainly hope we didn't put you out too much in coming all the way from Hollywood.⁴¹

Mrs. ROGERS. Not at all.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STRIPLING. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Mr. Oliver Carlson.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Carlson, do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. CARLSON. I do.

⁴¹ See appendix, p. 533, for exhibit 54.

TESTIMONY OF OLIVER CARLSON

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Carlson, will you state your full name and present address, please?

MR. CARLSON. My name is Oliver Carlson. My address is 1728 Westerly Terrace, Los Angeles, Calif.

MR. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Carlson?

MR. CARLSON. I was born in Sweden, July 31, 1899.

MR. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

MR. CARLSON. I am a writer and teacher and I specialize in the field of political science, more particularly in the field of propaganda techniques. I have worked in that field for about 20 years or more.

MR. STRIPLING. Where are you presently employed?

MR. CARLSON. I am employed as a teacher by the extension division of the University of California.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the testimony of Mr. Carlson will be developed by Mr. Gaston and Mr. Mandel of the committee's staff.

MR. GASTON. Mr. Carlson, how long have you been a student of the Communist movement in the United States?

MR. CARLSON. Well, I should say all of my adult life and for the past 20 years in particular I have given it especial study. When I was with the University of Chicago from 1930 through 1932 in the political science department I made a special study of the propaganda techniques of the Communist movement both abroad and in this country.

MR. GASTON. Have you written any books or articles dealing with certain phases of communism?

MR. CARLSON. Yes, I have written a great many articles over a period of 20 years or so, appearing in many of the national magazines. Also in several of my books I have made special reference to the problem of communism. One of these books, titled "A Mirror for Californians," which I wrote in 1939 and the early part of 1940, and which was published in the spring of 1941, has a good deal of information about the Communist movement in California, and in one chapter dealing with Hollywood I devote a part of that chapter to a discussion of the Communist infiltration in Hollywood up to that time.

MR. GASTON. Would you go into more detail with regard to the Communist infiltration in Hollywood, please, sir?

MR. CARLSON. Well, if I may I would like to give you as a background a paragraph or two as to what I had to say about it in this book of mine, and the material of which was written, as I say, 9 years ago.

MR. GASTON. Is that agreeable, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN. Yes. May I interrupt? Mr. Gaston, would you give your full name?

MR. GASTON. Yes, sir. Robert B. Gaston, G-a-s-t-o-n.

THE CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

MR. CARLSON. I am quoting now from pages 154, 5, and 6, and the chapter is entitled "There Is No Town Called Hollywood."

I said:

Here is the third ring just getting under way.

I might say parenthetically that I had described Hollywood as a vast three-ring circus. I continue:

It is a unique performance given by what we may designate as our Hollywood newllyweds.

It all began back in 1935, when social consciousness suddenly hit movieland. Like all new fads and fancies, it was embraced with rapturous enthusiasm. Here was something great and good, something new and daring—but not too daring. Stalin himself had just announced that Russia now had the only genuine democracy; the Communist Party was wrapping itself in the Stars and Stripes and declaring that “Communism is twentieth century Americanism.” President Roosevelt, no less, had taken the national lead in denouncing economic royalists and political reactionaries; while out in California, Upton Sinclair under the slogan of “End poverty in California” had captured the Democratic gubernatorial nomination in 1934 and amassed nearly a million votes.

In the favorable circumstances it is quite understandable how Hollywood sophisticates came to coin the slogan, “It’s smart to be a Red.” Astrologists, spiritualists, graphologists, mystics, and fortune tellers of a hundred varieties, who had long adorned the parties and gave aid and comfort to the great and near great of cinemaland, were unceremoniously dumped. Their places were taken by serious-minded young men and women who explained the inner workings of dialectical materialism, the theory of the class struggle, the insoluble contradiction of our capitalism, and the inevitability of the rule of the proletariat. Drawing room tables were now replaced with the works of Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Browder, and above all John Strachey.

I will not continue, Mr. Questioner, except to say that I follow through here and indicate how the Hollywood pocketbooks, which had never been too tightly closed, were open wide to aid the cause and its champions, writers, directors, and actors, and all of these others joining in, and how when the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League became organized and staged a series of meetings the Communists were able to use this, drawing into it vast numbers of good American citizens who were definitely anti-Nazi, but the movement was, of course, controlled and led by the Communist groups in Hollywood.

MR. GASTON. Do you know of anyone being sent out from New York to Hollywood to conduct the activities of the Communists in Hollywood?

MR. CARLSON. Yes; I do. I know there were a number of people sent out at various times. V. J. Jerome was one of them, but the person I think of in particular was a man whose name was Eli Jacobson.

Eli Jacobson was from New York. I had known him and his family many, many years ago when we were boys. Eli Jacobson was a charter member of the Communist Party in America. Back in the middle twenties he had been director of the Workers School in New York City.

I have here, in order to identify that, a copy of the announcement of courses of the Workers School for the year 1926–27, and in it in two different places Mr. Eli Jacobson appears as a teacher of courses.

I might add that in this same school there were teaching such names as have been mentioned here—Albert Trachtenberg, the man who was said to be the head of the Cultural Commission of the Communist Party, and who has been the head man of International Publishers, the publication house of the Communist Party for many years.

MR. MANDEL. Mr. Carlson, how is that school designated on the title of the catalog?

MR. CARLSON. On the title of the catalog it says “The Workers School,” and below it says in quotes “Training for the class struggle.”

I might possibly read from its definition at the beginning.

It says:

Education in a class society cannot be indifferent to the struggle between classes nor can it be impartial toward the contesting groups.

It goes on with the typical Communist Party line. This is and has been for many years the Communist Party school. Earl Browder,

William Z. Foster, Jack Satachov, William Weinstone, almost every important leader of the Communist Party, has at one time or another conducted classes or seminars in that school.

Mr. Jacobson was, as I say, at one time director of this school and also served as an instructor in it. He went to Russia and taught for the University of Moscow for a time, I believe, and has always been considered a high functionary and a particularly able propagandist for the Communist movement.

Well, to get back to the case, I bumped into Mr. Jacobson in Los Angeles some time in 1936 but his name was not conspicuous as a Communist there. He was closely associated at that time with a lady known as Mrs. Beryl La Cava, B-e-r-y-l L-a C-a-v-a. Mrs. La Cava was the divorced wife of Gregory La Cava, a very splendid motion-picture director.

As I recall from the newspaper accounts of the divorce proceedings, Mr. La Cava accused his wife of being a very ardent Communist.

Toward the fall of 1938 my phone rang a number of times and Mr. Jacobson, who had not been on any friendly terms with me for 15 years, or more, was suddenly anxious to talk with me.

I finally saw him one evening. He was very much perturbed and said he felt I was the only old friend he had to whom he could come and talk because he had decided to break with the Communist Party.

Then he told me how he had been sent to Hollywood under specific instructions from the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and that his duties in Hollywood were to conduct classes and, in general, educational propaganda for the Communist Party among film folk—not among the rank-and-file workers, but, rather, among the elite, so to speak. Those were the terms he used, and that for the past 2 or 2½ years that had been the main purpose of his work.

He told me he had prepared the ground work for several meetings for V. J. Jerome, who was, according to Mr. Rushmore's testimony, the active man at the head of Communist activities insofar as Hollywood and the film industry was concerned. He mentioned that he had also helped prepare the ground work for several meetings for Mr. Kyle Crichton. Mr. Crichton was at the time, and I believe still is, one of the editors of Collier's Magazine.

At that time Mr. Crichton had been writing under the name of Robert Forsythe, I believe it is, in the New Masses, a series of articles on cultural problems. He was very much lionized in Hollywood and spoke at a large number of small meetings.

Mr. Jacobson told me that he and Mrs. LaCava were largely instrumental in arranging these meetings.

Mr. Jacobson likewise informed me that part of his job at that time was to see to it that many of these important film personalities were softened up so that they would agree to join the various front organizations which the Communist Party was then sponsoring in the Hollywood region.

I do not recall all of the organizations he mentioned, but there were some. There was the League Against War and Fascism. There was the Committee to Boycott the Olympics in Berlin. There were the various Communist front committees for the defense of Spain. There were a whole host of other organizations which he referred to at that time.

Mr. MANDEL. Was the Western Writers Congress one of those organizations?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, very definitely, the Western Writers Congress, which took place in San Francisco in November of 1936, was also one of those for which Mr. Jacobson had done preliminary spade work in helping to bring a number of writers from Hollywood.

One other thing he told me was that his job was to prepare the groundwork for getting substantial contributions for the front organizations after people had been sufficiently prepared for the various party educational units, and possibly even for the party, itself.

Mr. Jacobson, I might say, was terribly agitated. He was afraid he was going to be killed. I saw him and Mrs. LaCava on a number of occasions during the next 8 or 10 months, and then he left Los Angeles altogether and I never heard of him since. I don't know whether he is dead or alive.

Mr. McDOWELL. Do you believe he was sincere in helping to put the party in power?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. Mr. Jacobson had been, as I said, one of the foundation members of the Communist Party; he had been one of the originators of it, and had enjoyed the trust of the leaders of the party. He would not have had the position of Director of the Official Communist Party School if he had not enjoyed that position.

He had been taken to Moscow, as I say, both to do some teaching and I imagine to also be prepared for other work to be done in this country.

Mr. Jacobson did not appear openly as a Communist at any time during this period he was in Hollywood. His job was to sort of carry his work on under the other guises.

Mr. GASTON. He was the undercover man?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, in a sense; yes. He certainly never was a speaker, to my knowledge, and he said he was instructed not to appear as a speaker at Communist Party rallies because he had this other important job assigned to him.

Mr. GASTON. Mr. Carlson, are there any educational institutions used by the Communists to develop their propaganda in Hollywood?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, indeed. After all, Communist indoctrination has to proceed, among other ways, through the use of classes and schools. There had been a Communist workers' school in Los Angeles for a number of years, but it never amounted to very much. However, along about 1940, I should say, the announcement was made that a new general progressive or radical educational center was to be organized.

Mr. William Wolfe, W-o-l-f-e, I believe he spells it, who had been an educational director for the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, and who was not a Communist, told me he had been approached and offered the job of director of this new educational center. He wanted to know if I was interested. I said I was interested only if he knew who was going to be on the board of directors, and who was behind it.

Within the matter of a few weeks there was a good deal of evidence to show that this school was to be controlled by the Communists. Well-known names of Communists began to appear and Mr. Wolfe, who, up to that time, had been a very close friend of mine, and had called on me frequently, suddenly became very distant. He was in the com-

pany of these other people and with them established the Peoples Educational Center.

This organization, this school, has been functioning and is still functioning to this date.

Mr. William Wolfe was removed as director after a relatively short period, and two or three other people, I believe, served as directors, but for the past 2 years the director has been Mr. Sidney Davison, D-a-v-i-s-o-n.

Sidney Davison—and I think there is ample evidence on this—was a member of the Communist Party in the New York area and was sent out to Hollywood specifically to take over the job of director of this school. He is the director at the present time.

I have in my possession here two of the official bulletins of the Peoples Educational Center. I have the one published for the summer session of 1945. I have a photostat of the one for the winter of 1947, and I have copied out in longhand material from a similar bulletin for the year 1944. Perhaps I can best explain what this Peoples Educational Center is—

Mr. GASTON. Mr. Carlson, may I interrupt you right there?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. GASTON. Is there anybody connected with the motion-picture industry on the staff of that school?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, indeed, most assuredly. In fact, they have always devoted a good deal of attention to courses in screen writing, motion-picture production, and things like that.

Mr. GASTON. Could we have some of those names, please?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes. On the board of directors for 1947 appears Mr. John Howard Lawson, who has been mentioned here before. On the advisory board appears the name of Helmer Bergman. Mr. Helmer Bergman is a well-known pro-Communist in Los Angeles working in the film industry. He has been very active with the Conference of Studio Unions in its attempt to gain control over the trade unions.

On this board was the name of Mr. Herbert Sorrell, who is the head of the Conference of Studio Unions, president, I believe, of the Hollywood Painters local, and who has been in long and close association with all Communist and Communist-front organizations over a period of years.

On this advisory board also appears the name of Frank Tuttle. Likewise, the name of Sandra Gorney, G-o-r-n-e-y, whose husband, I believe, is a song writer in the film industry. Sandra Gorney's name has appeared rather frequently as a contributor of articles to the Peoples Daily World or the Daily Peoples World, and I think I have seen her name also on certain articles in Hollywood in the Daily Worker.

Among the courses given were—this is from the 1947 pamphlet⁴²—course on the history of the American labor movement given by Mr. Milton Tyre, of the law firm of Gallagher, Margolis, and Katz, two of whose members are here, I think, defending those charged with being un-American and subversive in their activities.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to make it very plain the committee has not made any charges yet.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; I understand that. I say they have been charged by people in Hollywood.

⁴² See appendix, p. 533, for exhibit 55.

I find a course entitled "Labor's Key Problems," and among the teachers of this course which deals specifically with the problems of the motion-picture industry, are Helmer Bergman, whom I mentioned a moment ago; William B. Esteman, E-s-t-e-m-a-n, an attorney in the firm of Esteman and Pestana, P-e-s-t-a-n-a. The firm of Esteman and Pestana are the official attorneys for the Conference of Studio Unions, Mr. Herbert Sorrell's organization, which has been accused—and I think justly—of being under Communist domination.

Also Mr. Victor Kaplan is listed here as one of the teachers in that school. He is an attorney, or was, according to this, in the firm of Gallagher, Margolis, and Katz.

But more specifically, we have the courses which I believe your committee is interested in. We have here a course called Motion Picture Direction, Thursday, 8:30 to 10 p. m. Coordinator Irving Pichel. Under this it says there will be several lectures.

A section on story preparation by Herber Biberman, who has been identified over a period of years with pro-Soviet organizations.

A lecture on production preparation by Vincent Sherman, S-h-e-r-m-a-n, who is, I believe, a screen writer.

A lecture called On the Set, by Frank Tuttle; one on camera, by Paul Ivano, I-v-a-n-o. I know nothing about Mr. Ivano.

One on cutting, by Mr. Edward Dmytryk, D-m-y-t-r-y-k, a well-known Hollywood producer.

One on production, by Kenneth Macgowan, a well-known Hollywood producer.

Music, by Hugo Friedhofer, who is working in that field in the movies, and the summary by Mr. Pichel.

There is likewise a course entitled "The Motion Picture's Illusion and Reality." I find under the description of the course the things that are to be discussed, and included are the following about the film industry: Who owns the industry? Who controls it? How is content determined? What is the role of censorship? Why the star system? The current status of the guilds and unions, and the role of motion pictures in international politics.

The teachers of this course, according to this document, are Ben Barzman, B-a-r-z-m-a-n, Karen Morley, M-o-r-l-e-y, a well known screen star; Arnold Manoff, M-a-n-o-f-f, then it says "and others."

There are also three courses in screen writing given: Screen Writing 1 is conducted by Robert Lees. Screen Writing 2, by Val Burton. Screen Writing 3 by Stanley Rubin. I will quote from their folder here as to who these people are in just a moment.

There are a number of other courses, naturally. In the list of biographies of instructors here I find it says, about Mr. Helmer Bergman:

Labor leader for many years; member of IBEW No. 40, A. F. of L.; chairman, motion picture stewards council.

Under Herbert Biberman, it says:

B. S., University of Pennsylvania: attended Baker's 47 Work Shop, Yale University. Credits in the motion picture industry as writer of original stories, director, and is now associate producer.

I find under "Val Burton":

Writer-producer at Universal.

He is mentioned as one of the teachers of screen writing.

Mr. MANDEL. Mr. Carlson, under "Mr. Biberman," does it say that he ever took courses abroad?

Mr. CARLSON. In the 1947 folder it does not say that, but I think it does say that in the 1945 folder. Yes. They change the statements a little bit from year to year.

I now quote from the folder of the Peoples Educational Center for the winter of 1945, where it says, about Herbert Biberman:⁴³

Six months in the U. S. S. R. studying the Soviet Theater. Four years with the Theater Guild in New York as actor and director.

They change the description a little bit from year to year.

There is Guy Endore, author of Babouk, and coauthor of screen play, GI Joe, and other things. Mr. Endore has been identified with Communist fronts in Los Angeles since I came out there in the spring of 1935.

Mr. Robert Lees, it also says here, has been actively writing in the motion-picture industry for 12 years; for the past 3 years "has been under contract to Paramount."

Kenneth Macgowan, "Dramatic critic from 1910 to 1923; play producer from 1923 to 1931; motion-picture producer since 1932."

I find here also Charles B. Millholland teaching a course at this school. He is a screenwriter and playwright. It says "Adapted his brother's book to the screen as Submarine Patrol. Author of stage, screen, and radio successes, Twentieth Century.

I find here Mr. Pichel listed as "Motion Picture Director. Has been prominent for many years in the New York stage. Has been both an actor and director in cinema."

I find the name Stanley Rubin, who was one of the men teaching the screen writing course. It says here, "Has written for Columbia Workshop, been writing for motion pictures since 1939. Produced at Universal. Now under contract at Columbia." And there are many others here.

Mr. MANDEL. Mr. Carlson, would you state concisely what you think is the object of training in the school you have mentioned?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, the Peoples Educational Center is an extremely effective organization for the indoctrination of large numbers of people particularly in the general Hollywood area, those concerned and interested in films and radio, with the Communist ideology. It also serves, as the courses indicate, to prepare these people for screen writing, radio writing, screen acting, radio acting, play writing, and the like.

In these courses not only are the general techniques of play writing, screen writing, and radio writing developed, but from the information I have had by word of mouth from many people who have gone to these classes every course also has brought into it a good deal of the current Communist Party line, whatever that may be at the particular moment.

I have found no evidence of anyone who is actively anti-Communist employed on the staff. There have been several innocent people drawn into the staff at various times, specialists in many fields. Those who got in, such as Mr. Dean McHenry, of the University of California at Los Angeles, when he discovered he was being used by this move-

⁴³ See appendix, p. 533, for exhibit 56.

ment, refused to teach any further and openly repudiated the school and communism.

Mr. GASTON. Mr. Carlson, in your opinion how should a Communist be defined?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, I should think that looking at the situation as it exists in the world today we have to think in terms first of the Communist Party member who is directly and organizationally tied to the Communist Party and who, of course, is under the very strict discipline of that party which functions virtually as a military organization in terms of structure and discipline.

But over and beyond this group which, according to the testimony of the representative of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, was slightly more than 80,000 at the beginning of this year, and which they hoped would reach 100,000 by the end of September of this year—beyond that I should say are those who are pro-Communist, that is, those who are ready to give first loyalty to the Soviet Union and any of its activities, whether they are done by the Communist Party, the front organizations, or what have you.

Within this group, according to Communists whom I have spoken with, they feel they represent on an average three to four times the membership of the Communist Party itself.

Then beyond that we have those who go along, the fellow travelers who follow Communist Party policy and dictation most of the time, but not necessarily all of the time.

Mr. GASTON. To your knowledge, how does the Communist Party function, Mr. Carlson?

Mr. CARLSON. I think the effectiveness of the Communist Party is determined by its organizational structure which was developed originally by Lenin nearly 40 years ago. There is a basic difference between the two divisions. The Russian Social Democratic Party existed from about 1903 to 1905 and centered around the concept of party structure. It was Lenin who maintained at that time that for effective work the party must be a small, highly integrated, highly disciplined organization of professional revolutionaries—and he used the term “professional revolutionaries.”

The Menshevik faction felt they should have a broader organization, they should not be as well disciplined, and should be more or less in line with the social democratic parties.

Around this basic issue of organizational structure the party split and Lenin's concept prevailed. That concept was carried through successfully in Russia and when the Communist International was established the provisos laid down, first in the famous 21 points of the Communist International, and later in a whole series of special directives and resolutions at various Congresses, and which were carried over into the actions of the various Communist parties of the world—these parties followed the pattern set down originally by Lenin. That is, the party was a small, highly disciplined organization functioning, in a sense, by what Robert Miner described at one time as a “system of wheels within wheels.” That is, they were the inner wheel which in turn turned and moved larger wheels or masses of people and organizations around them.

Mr. McDOWELL. The opposition to that inside the Communist Party was Trotsky?

Mr. CARLSON. Not at that time. I think Trotsky was in part opposed to it, but I think his differences were somewhat different, on a different line. He came to accept the Lenin concept. No, they were men like Mastov and Plekanov, and a group of other names which escape me at the moment, which became what was known as the Menshevik group.

This party, this group, was liquidated by the Communists. We have, living in America, incidentally, one of the members of that old executive committee when the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks were still united, Raphael Abramowitz, who was on the purge list for a long time, and I believe still is.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Carlson, I have one more question. Not all of them were liquidated. If I recall correctly, there was one rather minor figure in those days named Andrei Vishinsky who made the grade finally.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, that is true. There were some of them who later repudiated by open concession the error of their ways and were then allowed to come into the Communist Party. Not only was Vishinsky one of those men but the man who has been chief editorial writer for Pravda; Soflovsky was one of those men who fought bitterly against the Communists well up through the early years of the Russian revolution, and was finally compelled to eat crow. There were many of those.

Reading the proceedings of the Communist Party Congress, you notice how every once in a while these men still have their pasts dragged out and held as a threat over them to keep them in line.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, referring again to the catalog of the Peoples Educational Center, the one of 1947, in order to get some idea of the complexion of the school publicizing these courses in directing, acting, and so on, it says:

Thursday, 8:30-10 p. m.: The Soviet Union, a new civilization. A seminar type course which will discuss the social, economic, and political structure of the U. S. S. R. Topics to be discussed will include: Man as a citizen of a planned society—social security, health insurance, etc.—education—science in Soviet society—trade unions under socialism—art and culture—national minority relationships—the Soviet Union and the UNO.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the name of that school?

Mr. STRIPLING. Peoples Educational Center.

Mr. MANDEL. Mr. Carlson, do you have an additional list of persons connected with the motion-picture industry who are connected with the Peoples Educational Center?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, as one goes through the various catalogs, which is the only place where you can get the authoritative material, you find many other names appearing. For instance, in the 1944 brochure, I see these names as teachers; which were not mentioned heretofore: Morton Grant, a screen writer; Thomas Job. It said he was then a screen writer at Warner Bros. Michael Uris, a screen writer; Dorothy Tree, a film actress; Leo Hurwitz, who had been, and I believe still is, connected with the film industry; Earl Robinson, well known for his songs and ballads.

I find that in that year among the teachers was a Mr. Charles J. Katz, attorney; Mr. Benjamin Margolis, attorney; Mr. Leo Gallagher, attorney, and Mr. Milton Tyre, attorney. They were all of the firm of Gallagher, Margolis, and Katz.

Mr. GASTON. Mr. Carlson, why do the Communists devote so much time and attention to gaining control and influence in Hollywood, in your opinion?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, as a non-Hollywood or a nonscreen person, it seems to me the answer to that falls into several questions. First of all, the evidence is overwhelming from the writings and statements of leading Communists in Europe, Russia, and United States that the film industry itself is one of the most effective mass mediums of information. Since it is necessary for Communists to try to use influence, any mass medium of information, that per se would make the film industry a very vital one.

Secondly, I should say the fact that screen personalities have attained an amazing public following—and I think this has been well demonstrated right here in these hearings during the past few days by the way in which large numbers of people are anxious to hear and to see screen stars. That applies all over the country.

To the Communists who want to get as large a hearing as they can for themselves, and to get their front organizations made as respectable as possible, what could be more effective than to try to inveigle, in some way or another, various screen personalities to serve on their committees?

When you have Katherine Hepburn speaking at a front organization for the Communists you can be sure there will be thousands of people there, where there might only be hundreds if the regular Communist Party functionaries appeared. Whenever any of the other screen personalities lend their names or their signatures to any organization or cause which the Communists are promoting, it automatically makes this cause seem more fashionable in the eyes of unsophisticated people all over. They say, "If this big star is for it I guess it must be all right." That is very natural.

So, from that point of view they are able to influence opinion by merely using the names of these people, or having them appear.

Then I should say there is a third very important point, and that is the financial aspect. I do not have to tell this committee that the motion-picture industry is not exactly a sweatshop industry. The salaries, even in the trades, are probably the highest in the country, so when you can win screen writers, screen actors, directors, producers, or their wives or sisters or children to support your cause, you are helping to open the way for a great deal of financial aid.

I might say that Mr. Jacobson, as I testified earlier, told me that untold tens of thousands of dollars were collected through the softening-up process of his various house meetings in Hollywood.

The Hollywood Citizen News, a daily paper in Hollywood, after careful investigation, reported in an editorial a few years ago that they thought at least \$3,000,000 had been taken out of Hollywood up to that time.

At a meeting held very recently in Hollywood on one of the large front organizations, I believe, something like \$87,000 was collected. These sums are absolutely fabulous. Here is a treasure chest which is important. Why worry about Moscow's gold when you can get Hollywood greenbacks.

Of course, there is still one other aspect, and I think this has been neglected up to this point in the hearing. That is the fact that in terms of the number of people employed in Hollywood, those who are

actors, writers, producers, and directors represent only a small minority of the total number employed in the motion-picture industry. The tens of thousands of workers in the industry are those who are the stage crews, and who do all the other technical jobs. There they struggle for the conquest of these labor organizations, to win their support, which is, of course, a typical and long-standing technique and one of their most pertinent objectives—to win the labor movement.

This idea to win economic control over the trade unions in Hollywood would be a real feather in their cap and could be used, then, to bring economic pressure to bear on the entire industry as occasion would demand because the Communists consider the trade unions to be organs for revolutionary purposes.

We need only see what has happened in France, Italy, and elsewhere during the past few weeks to see that in action.

The Communists have not succeeded in doing this in Hollywood but I must say that during the past 12 years where I have been watching it at first-hand they have certainly put up a tremendous struggle to achieve all these objectives.

Mr. GASTON. Do you believe there is any attempt at thought control in the motion-picture industry, and, if so, how is it done and by whom?

Mr. CARLSON. I have been hearing a lot about that. In fact, the pro-Communists arranged a conference in Hollywood only a matter of weeks ago which was called a thought-control congress. They were shouting very loudly that thought control was being put over on the American people and on the film industry in particular.

It seems rather amusing to me—sadly amusing, in fact—that people endorse and support the Communist Party line when we know that in Soviet Russia the films, the radio, the press, and every other vehicle of communication has been completely controlled by the State and the Communist Party.

I say when we see that record then to have the Communists here locally becoming the champions of freedom of thought, it is weird, to say the least. But that is part of what I would call "Communist semantics." They make words fit the definitions which they desire, and, consequently, they take on various forms.

But insofar as actual thought control in Hollywood is concerned, I have seen none, except perhaps from the point of view of the pressure which has been brought by these very same pro-Communist elements themselves upon the industry. During these last 8 years I have been amazed to discover that outside of two minor films which were sort of a sly take-off on communism—*Ninotchka* was one, and I have forgotten the name of the other.

Mr. GASTON. Was that Comrade X?

Mr. CARLSON. Comrade X, that is right. Then there were three definitely pro-Soviet films which were made during the war, and I can understand why they were made. Russia was then our ally, and we certainly bent over backward to give them everything they wanted. But over and above that, the important aspect of thought control is this: During all these years when thousands of films have been made from the point of view of sheer drama I haven't seen a single film built around attempts of people to escape from the clutches of the G. P. U., but we certainly have had them trying to escape from the clutches of the Gestapo.

We have had lots of films dealing with British imperialism, French imperialism, Dutch imperialism, and American imperialism of one kind or another. I have seen nothing which deals with Soviet imperialism.

We have had a lot of films about farmers in this country. I have seen no attempt by the motion-picture industry to tell the story of how several million individual farmers in Russia were liquidated outright, or sent to concentration camps, because they tried to resist the collectivism program of the Soviet government.

I think the thought control has been all on the other side. I am very sure as a student of propaganda that propaganda is effective not merely from what you say but from what you do not say. By refusing to permit the American people to see in films the true picture of the various things that have been going on in the Soviet Union it has been easy to keep that matter out of discussion.

Meanwhile, of course, there have been these many films and I think there is a place for them, films of social conscience, which deals with aspects of weaknesses in our own democratic society.

One other point: I believe that the place of the film is to deal with all aspects of life, not as films of propaganda but as merely mirroring what is happening. I think it is high time we call attention to the fact that a large number of these writers who have been mentioned here today, yesterday, and the day before, and who believe and actively support and espouse the cause of communism when they do pictures pointing out the defects of the American system, the economic and political system, I think they come before us with unclean hands. I do not think they are honest in their criticism.

They have another objective, the purpose being not to try to remedy these things within the framework which our Constitution and our various State laws provide, but, rather, to break the spirit of the American people, to make them think the American way of life is not good, that all politicians are opportunists, that businessmen in general are corrupt, that labor leaders who do not follow the Communist line are venal and stupid and agents of capitalism, as they call it. These are all part of the general picture which these men have been giving. I think that is control, very definitely. That I am opposed to, and I think every American is opposed to it.

Mr. MANDEL. Mr. Carlson, has there been any effort on the part of the Communist group in Hollywood to control the public schools of the community?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, yes; there has. We have had a very bad situation in Hollywood insofar as the American Federation of Teachers local is concerned. That has been dominated by the Communists for a period of several years. I have spoken about this matter with national officers of the American Federation of Teachers at various times, and I know they are very much worried about it. There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of teachers who probably would belong to that organization, but many of them have told me, "I won't join the American Federation of Teachers local in Los Angeles as long as it spends its time merely supporting Russia and denouncing everything that America is," and doesn't function as a trade union movement.

Mr. MANDEL. Mr. Carlson—

Mr. CARLSON. One other point. Miss LaRue McCormick, a well-known local Communist, has been running for the board of education at various times. In fact, she ran as a Communist in the elections in the spring of this year, this last April, to be exact. Running as an avowed Communist, it may be of interest to this committee to know that she received a total of 24,543 votes for member of the board of education in the Los Angeles school district.

In 1943, when she ran for the same position, she received only 15,000 votes. So she had picked up about 9,543 votes of people who were definitely ready to support a Communist on the board of education.

Mr. MANDEL. What is the source of your information—

Mr. McDOWELL. Excuse me. Do you know how many votes were cast?

Mr. CARLSON. There were about 300,000 or 350,000; I don't remember that figure. It was a fairly heavy vote for a board of education vote, which is usually light. But it, of course, was small compared with the total vote that is normally cast in a national or even a municipal election for mayor. This was a very large vote, I should say. It represented perhaps 8 or 9 percent of the total vote cast in that election—maybe more than that. I could supply the committee with figures. These quotations I take, by the way, are from the People's Daily World of April 5, 1947. I am quoting—

Mr. McDOWELL. That is a Communist paper?

Mr. CARLSON. That is a Communist paper on the west coast, which circulates very widely in Hollywood.

Mr. GASTON. Mr. Carlson, can you tell us a little bit about the strength of communism in the labor organizations and cultural organizations, as briefly as possible?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, they function in all of these organizations. So far as the Los Angeles picture is concerned, I should say the greatest strength in the labor movement lies within the CIO. Mr. Philip Connelly, the secretary of the CIO council, has I think, at least to my satisfaction, been proved to be a Communist, and works with them and has for years. The whole host of officials in other unions, in the CIO unions, do the same. The main strength of the Communists in the A. F. of L. has been precisely in the group of unions called the Conference of Studio Unions, headed by Mr. Herbert Sorrell. But I think that when Mr. Brewer comes on the stand he will probably develop that at greater detail, in greater detail.

Mr. GASTON. In your opinion, Mr. Carlson, what is the best method available to combat communism in the various fields?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, it seems to me that possibly it might be well if we could devise a sort of law comparable to the Pure Food and Drug Act, where we label poison so that people won't get it, or adulterated foods—making them put the label on it. I would like to see some sort of a label that had to be put on all types of Communist propaganda—point one. I think if it were labeled for what it is, it would in itself help a great deal. I don't know whether that can be done, but I think that is a point to bear in mind.

I think if every issue of any Communist publication had to carry a notice in a box in black type stating "This organ is printed in the interest of communism," and which seeks to destroy the American form of government and functions as an agent of the Soviet Government, it probably would do a good deal to stop some of those things.

But over and above that, I think that the strength of communism lies in its organizational structure. If we can destroy the structure, this thing which Lenin set up long ago, I think then, while you don't destroy Communist agitation or propaganda in America—I don't think you can do that—you can, I think, reduce it very, very severely.

From that point of view I believe that it would be certainly a good thing if the Communist Party itself were outlawed. I know this will mean that the Communist Party will function illegally, but it would also mean that thousands and tens of thousands of people who now sort of flutter along the edges would withdraw. It means that Communist meetings could not take place openly, in public halls, schools, and churches. It would mean that we would have destroyed a vital social cancer. I know there is always danger that innocent people would be destroyed along with it, but I think if you have got a cancer in your system you have got to have an operation and while there may be some good live tissue that goes out with it, I would rather take the chance on the operation so the person can recover than to have them say afterward, "Well, what a handsome looking corpse he is."

MR. GASTON. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

MR. McDOWELL. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman, but I have been an amateur student of communism and Communist activity and its history for more than 20 years, and I doubt very seriously if any witness that ever came before this committee—Mr. Chairman and Mr. Vail—has expressed such a profound knowledge of this phenomena as Mr. Carlson.

There is some great agitation in America to do something about the immigration laws, to slow down immigration. Something should be done to readjust those laws. But to slow down or stop immigration may stop future citizens like Mr. Carlson from coming to the United States. I feel that you have made a great contribution to your country. Thank you, sir.

MR. CARLSON. Well, thank you. May I say I was brought to this country as a baby. I didn't come here except my parents brought me over when I was a child in arms.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

MR. VAIL. Mr. Carlson, have you any knowledge of whether or not the school to which you referred is an accredited school under the GI training provisions?

MR. CARLSON. So far as I understand, a very serious attempt was made to get the Peoples Educational Center accredited. I don't think they were accredited. I know that the equivalent of this school in San Francisco—the San Francisco Labor School—at least for a short time did succeed in getting Government money. I can't honestly state that I know whether the Peoples Educational Center is getting it or not. But I think that was stopped. If they did get it for a short time; I think it was stopped.

MR. VAIL. In your opinion, Mr. Carlson, is this congressional investigation into communistic activities in Hollywood justified?

MR. CARLSON. Not only justified, but I should think long overdue. I think a full-scale airing of the situation that we have had out there is going to be a very healthy thing for the country and for the whole of the Hollywood industry.

Mr. VAIL. Would you consider the communistic threat to America today a dangerous threat?

Mr. CARLSON. I think it is the most dangerous threat that the United States has ever faced since it was founded. I know of no threat as great as this, and the evidence I think is to be seen in the actions of the Soviet Union in every sphere here in the past 2 or 3 years.

Mr. VAIL. From your observation of the activities of the committee, of the hearings which you have heard to date, is it your feeling that the committee has acted as an investigative body, or as prosecutor or persecutor?

Mr. CARLSON. Well, I certainly have seen no prosecution or persecution. I think each witness has told what he had to say, whether it was in the form of facts or opinions, and I think your committee has been very kind and generous in listening to us and letting us tell our story. I know that some of these people that came out here felt that they were really jeopardizing their own economic security by doing this. I think they should be congratulated for it. I don't happen to be in the industry and I don't have that particular problem, but I know that many of them did. I think your committee is doing a very good job and I hope it continues on this same basis of getting everything that can be said by the people who are on both sides of this issue.

Mr. VAIL. Skilled as you are in the mechanics of propaganda, as evidenced here today, I wonder if you would venture an opinion with respect to the criticisms that have been directed against this committee by newspaper columnists, by editorialists, by the attorney for the film producers' association, and by the president or general manager, Johnston, of the association.

I am a confirmed moviegoer myself and last night it was my experience to take in a moving picture that showed a flash scene at this hearing. It was a short flash and it was followed by a rather extended statement on the part of Eric Johnston, in which he stated that an effort was being made to establish the fact that the films were colored, to introduce Communist propaganda and other statements to like effect, which were bound to have an effect upon the thinking of the public that viewed those films. Certainly, the writings of the editorialists and the columnists and these moving pictures where Mr. Johnston has the preferred spot to present his views to the public would have the effect of depreciating the effort of this committee, which is, after all, directed by the Congress of the United States to investigate this situation, and as a matter of fact, the investigation was not launched until it was indicated that it was necessary by the previous investigation of the subcommittee that went to Hollywood to gain on-the-ground facts.

What is your impression of the effect that it would have upon the American people for men of standing in the community and in the industry, and with the influence of the newspapers whose point of view undoubtedly would have an influence upon the public? Don't you think today that it is necessary to alert the American people to the danger of communism and not to lull them into a sense of false security?

Mr. CARLSON. With respect to your last point, sir, I agree very thoroughly.

I do think, on the other hand, that the producers have, of course, the complete right to express any opinion they want to. I think they are very wrong in what they are proposing and saying about this committee. I think that in the case of some of these people they have kept their eyes so closed to this whole issue, closed deliberately, and as the biblical injunction says, "There are none so blind as those that will not see." I think there are others who have been so much concerned with making money out of the films. And the films, of course, are highly sensitive to public criticism of all kinds. They don't realize how they have reacted to the criticism from the left, and now when they see public pressure and indignation arising over the laxness, shall we say, the carelessness with which they have looked after an industry, which may belong to them in terms of fiscal ownership, but which certainly belongs to the American people as a great social institution and amusement center to which they go by the tens of millions every week, I think they are a little bit panicky. I think they are good men, honest men, and good Americans, but I think they are frightened and because of that are issuing I should say injudicious statements.

Might I add one other point with respect to the editorials. In a study which was made a number of years ago, and a study which I supplemented of my own to some degree, on the effect of editorials on the thinking of the American people, I am rather sorry to say that very few people are very effectively influenced by editorials.

I know that on the Hearst chain, the study that was made on that, they found that only 3 percent of the population of the readers of the Hearst chain, admitted they were influenced by the editorials. They are influenced by the news. They are influenced by what happens.

But the influence of the editor in American life has been steadily declining over the years. The newspaper as a social institution has become what it is by name, a newspaper, and not an editorial paper.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Carlson, I must interrupt you. I think we are going too far afield. This is an investigation of alleged communism in the moving-picture industry.

Mr. CARLSON. I am very sorry, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think to get into that field is something that this committee hasn't even thought of.

Mr. CARLSON. That is right; I agree with you.

The CHAIRMAN. As far as I am concerned, any man can write any darn thing about me that he want to. That is up to him. And I think the other members of the committee feel the same way.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I say something in view of what Mr. Carlson has just said? I am a very great admirer of the gentleman and his knowledge and brains but, as an editorial writer, I am not inclined to agree with him. I hope we are not through yet.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; you people have your private conversation afterward.

The Chair would like to announce at this time that the first witness and only witness this afternoon will be Mr. Walt Disney. No session on Saturday.⁴⁴

The witnesses on Monday, the first two witnesses, will be Mr. Eric Johnston and Mr. Roy Brewer. Then we will have as witnesses Mr.

⁴⁴ See appendix, p. 533, for exhibit 57.

John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo, Mr. Alvah Bessie, and Mr. Lavery.

Mr. STRIPLING. Emmett Lavery.

The CHAIRMAN. Emmett Lavery.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like for the Chair to instruct those last-named individuals to be sure and be present in response to the subpoena, which calls for their appearance on Monday, even though other witnesses who the committee was unable to hear this week will be heard. They are also to be called on Monday and will be expected to be here in response to the subpoena.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so instructs them, through their counsel.

Mr. STRIPLING. In addition, Mr. Chairman, I ask consent to include the entire catalog of People's Educational Center into the record. I ask that it be made a part of the record, the entire text.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Summer, 1945

PEOPLE'S EDUCATIONAL CENTER

HOLLYWOOD CENTER, 1717 NORTH VINE STREET, HOLLYWOOD 28

HEmpstead 7263

"It is of great importance to the future of our democracy that ways and means be devised to engage the maximum number of young people and adults in a continuous, fearless, and free discussion and study of public affairs."

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT.

FOREWORD

We are at this moment in the process of creating a new, hopeful world predicated upon the closer cooperation and mutual understanding of the peoples of each nation for the peoples of every other nation. In size it is a greatly diminished world because of the technological developments which this war has accelerated. In spirit, it is an immeasurably broadened world because of the united desire of the democratic nations to create the mutual understanding and common purpose which is the only sure way to achieve a lasting peace.

But what does this understanding of our fellow man demand of us? It demands a deeper knowledge of him, his language, his customs, his social cultural and industrial aims. It demands the study of our own and the other fellow's long-range historical aspirations, of his and our past attempts to meet the problems of a changing, growing world. It demands a knowledge of the modern tools of communication by which we can further human progress today—the words, the images, the symbols of radio, motion picture, book, pamphlet.

The People's Educational Center, founded only 2 years ago, has achieved a remarkable success in equipping its students to meet these significant challenges of our new world. In so doing, it has also pointed the way to enlarging professional activities, opening up vast fields of new and stimulating undertakings.

This year, for the first time, the People's Educational Center has projected a four-term year. Regular classes for the summer term will be held at the Hollywood Center, and the PEC will, during the same period, augment its extension services to labor organizations throughout the industrial areas of greater Los Angeles.

In addition to this comprehensive study program, the PEC plans to become a focal point for forums and institutes dealing with the problems of the day. Its further object is to provide a community cultural center where, through the presentation of significant theatrical, film, and radio productions, through art, music, and dance festivals, the people's audience will not only arrive at a fuller

appreciation of the arts and the artist, but will actually have a real participation in new creative endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Calendar, information.	Children's activities.
Economics, history, labor problems.	Recreational theater, body training.
Languages.	Dance.
Writing.	Biographical data-teaching staff.
Cinema.	Schedule of classes.
Psychology and child development.	

CALENDAR

Summer term.	Classes begin week of Monday, June 4,
Registration begins Monday, May 21,	1945.
1945.	Holiday, Wednesday, July 4, 1945.

Registration

Registration will be accepted in the Hollywood Center between 2:00 p. m. and 9:00 p. m. from Monday, May 21, 1945, through Monday, June 4, 1945. Register early since many classes are limited in size. Staff members will be in attendance to advise prospective students.

The fee for registration is one dollar.

School term

Classes will meet weekly for twelve one-and-one-half-hour sessions except where otherwise indicated. They will be held at the Hollywood Center, 1717 North Vine Street.

Tuition fees

The tuition fee for each course is indicated in the listing of classes. All fees are payable in full at time of registration. No fees returnable except to those entering the armed services. A list of courses open to individual admission may be obtained from the center.

Scholarships

Scholarships offered to union members and members of the armed forces must be applied for in writing to the registrar. College students, on presenting their student cards, will be accorded tuition reduction.

Transfers

For a transfer of class a fee of one dollar is charged. Transfers may not be made after the second session or to a class closed to registration.

The Student Council

The student council is an independent organization of student representatives from each class in the school. Educational and social activities of interest to the student body and to the general public are arranged and carried out through the council. The council publishes a student paper.

Forums and lecture series

The center will conduct forums and arrange lecture series from time to time. Students and those on the PEC mailing list will be notified of time and place.

ECONOMICS—HISTORY

LABOR PROBLEMS

One World—the foreign policies of the Big Four

Instructor: Thomas L. Harris

A brief survey of international affairs from the peace of Versailles to the San Francisco Conference will be followed by detailed examination of the special problems of the four great powers as they affect world peace. Emphasis to be placed on positive evidence that, in spite of basic differences in economic and political structure, the USA, the British Commonwealth, the USSR, and China are developing a growing common interest. Supplementary lectures by news and radio commentators and specialists in foreign affairs.

The following topics will be included:

Historical survey:

- Armistice, not Peace (1918-1933)
- How the Axis Prepared (1933-1939)
- False Solutions for Real Problems:
 - Great Britain Prepares for Munich
 - American "Isolationism"
 - The Soviet Union in Quarantine
 - The Abandonment of China

Unit for Victory:

The Atlantic Charter, Teheran, Cairo, Yalta, and San Francisco.

True Solutions for Real Problems:

- The Complex Necessities of the British Empire
- What the Soviet Union Really Wants
- China's Road to Nationhood
- The Conditions for American Prosperity
- The Obligations of the Big Four

Twelve sessions, Mondays, 8-10 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 4.

World perspectives

Coordinator (to be announced) and guest lecturers

Consideration of some of the more critical problems facing the postwar world:

Origin and persistence of Nazi racist doctrines.

The general problem of minority groups.

The special problem of the Japanese-Americans in the postwar United States.

Problems facing youth.

"Nationalism" and world organization.

The new Europe.

Environmentally induced motivations.

Food as a world problem.

Among the lecturers will be Judge Leon Yankwich, Prof. Harry Hoijer, Prof. Leonard Bloom, Prof. Howard Gilhousen, Peter de Lima, Alvin Wilder, Prof. David Appleman, Prof. Dean McHenry, Meyer Frieden, Mildren Raskin, Prof. Ralph Beals, Bruce Minton, John Howard Lawson.

Twelve sessions, Thursdays, 8-10 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 7.

60,000,000 Jobs—The Road to Economic Progress

Coordinator—Sanford Goldner, assisted by Katherine McTernan

A program for full employment after the war will be discussed by representatives of labor, business, and government.

The victories of peace, including full employment, will require the same kind of cooperation from all sections of the community necessary for the victories of war. While production for war will be a primary concern until final victory, reconversion and planning for peacetime production are now going on. What kind of a program is being developed by the leaders in the economic life of the Nation? The following questions, among others, will be given consideration:

What role should government play in insuring full employment?

What is the importance for full employment of the labor-management pledge for industrial peace?

How is the question of full employment affected by the Bretton Woods proposal, reciprocal trade agreements, and other measures bearing on international trade?

What wage program should be adopted for full employment and national prosperity?

Such questions as the above, the answers to which concern every citizen, will be considered by leading figures from the fields of labor, government, and industry, who will participate either as guest lecturers or members of panels.

Twelve sessions, Tuesdays, 8-10 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 5.

Political Economy

Instructor: Leo Bigelman

A presentation aimed to clarify some of the economic questions that face every one of us today. A few of the questions to be considered: What is the relationship of workers to our economy? What is the wealth of a nation? Who and what creates it? How are profits made? What are wages? What are the

differences between our prewar and our present economy? What do the wartime regulations of price control, wage control, rationing mean?

Should they be continued in peacetime? What is the difference between our capitalist society and socialist society? How can our capitalist society provide jobs, abundance, and security for all? What are the fundamental laws of social development? The course will be based upon the work of Marx, but due consideration will be given to the theories of other economists.

Twelve sessions, Thursdays 9-10 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 7.

Trade Union Workshop

Instructor: Jules Carson

Intended for all union members who desire to learn how to take a more active role in their unions. The class will be conducted as a miniature union meeting with the students participating as president, secretary, etc. Parliamentary procedure will be taught by application. The student-member will have an opportunity to raise problems facing him in his union for discussion. Grievance procedure, contract negotiation, and questions relating to the winning of a contract will be studied.

Day of the week and date of first session to be announced, \$6.

The History of American Labor Movement

Instructor: Ralph Winstead

The growth of trade unionism in America from before the American Revolution to the present-day organization of 12,000,000 workers. The historical roots for the changing functions of the trade unions in a changing society and the movement of labor toward independent political action will be discussed. Major attention will be paid to the significant contributions labor has made to preserve and extend American democracy and to labor's vital role throughout American history in defining the Nation.

Twelve sessions, Fridays, 8 to 10 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 8.

Principles and Practice of Organization

Instructor: Alice Ohaus

A practical study of principles, techniques, and the American tradition of clubs and organizations. How we develop a committee, a club, a community organization, including trade unions; techniques of conducting educational and fund-raising activities; mass meeting through an existing organization or a special project to meet a temporary community need will be among the topics discussed; conventions and conferences.

Twelve sessions, Fridays, 8 to 10 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 8.

China Today and Tomorrow

Instructor: Neil Enochs, assisted by Marshal Ho'o.

The recent social and political history of China. Topics: The period of imperialist domination; the national revolution under Sun Yat-sen; the Kuomintang, its development from 1927 to the present; the overseas Chinese and their influence on domestic policy; the Chinese labor movement; Sino-Japanese relations; the Chinese Communists and their role; present perspectives for national unity. Among important questions to be considered: Under what conditions can we expect an important postwar market in China? What type of leadership will the China of tomorrow be able to give in far eastern affairs? Can Chinese national unity be established under the present leadership of the Kuomintang?

Twelve sessions, Tuesdays, 8 to 10 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 5.

LANGUAGES

Russian I

Instructor: Alexandra Groth.

A thorough foundation for reading and writing Russian. First steps in grammar and conversation. Special phonograph records, produced under supervision of the instructor, will enable the student to utilize his home study time efficiently and will materially shorten the amount of time required to become proficient in understanding and speaking the language.

Twelve sessions, Tuesdays, 7 to 8:30 p. m., \$7.50.

First session, June 5.

Russian II

Instructor: Alexandra Groth

For those who have had previous study. Students will learn to read Russian newspapers, work out dramatic situations, and converse in Russian.

Twelve sessions, Tuesdays, 8:35 to 10 p. m., \$7.50.

First session, June 5.

Spanish I

Instructor: O. C. Jungwirth

A course where beginners will learn, in a functional way, to understand, speak, read and write Spanish in the shortest possible time and by the most modern and most interesting method for adults. The students hears and speaks Spanish from the very beginning, and thus learns to think in Spanish without the unnecessary handicap of translation.

Twenty-four sessions, Tuesdays and Fridays, 7 to 8:30 p. m., \$15.

First session, June 5.

Spanish II

Instructor: O. C. Jungwirth

For students who have completed Spanish I or its equivalent. Planned especially for those wishing to review their elementary Spanish, improve their pronunciation, and learn to converse in Spanish. As in Spanish I, only the most modern methods of instruction are used.

Twenty-four sessions, Tuesdays and Fridays, 8:35 to 10 p. m., \$15.

First session, June 5.

Spanish III

Instructor: O. C. Jungwirth

An advanced course, for students who have completed Spanish I and II or their equivalents. The psychologically sound teaching method insures that the student will learn to converse fluently in the Spanish tongue without having to undergo the superfluous procedure of mental translation.

Twelve sessions, Wednesdays, 7 to 8:30 p. m., \$7.50.

First session, June 6.

WRITING

Screenwriting I

Instructor: Howard Dimsdale

Lectures on the basic approach to writing for the screen. Class will discuss such elements of the screen treatment as the essentials of the story, character, construction, motivation, continuity, etc., concluding with problems of marketing. Twenty Best Screenplays, by Gassner and Nichols, will be used as textbook; in addition, current films will be selected for class analysis. The cost of the textbook is included in the tuition fee.

Twelve sessions, Mondays, 8:35 to 10 p. m., \$21.50.

First session, June 4.

Screenwriting II

Instructor: Michael Uris

A workshop course in the preparation of original stories for the screen. Students will develop their own material under the guidance of the instructor. Class discussions will emphasize the problems and potentials of motion pictures in wartime. Production of material will be slanted toward current markets.

Twelve sessions, Mondays, 8:35 to 10 p. m., \$18.

First session, June 4.

Short Story II

Instructor: Viola Brothers Shore

A workshop where writers and student writers discuss freely the social experiences of the American people, for the purpose of discovering their significance and evolving the techniques necessary to bring them back to the American people in the short story form.

This class will be open to all students who have at any time completed at the school an elementary course in the short story; to all professional writers; and to others whose written work qualifies them.

Twelve sessions, Wednesdays, 8:35 to 10 p. m., \$18.

First session, June 6.

Modern Novel

Instructors: Guy Endore and John Sanford

Designed as a workshop course for serious students. An analysis of form, structure, plot, character, theme. Readings from student's work-in-progress, followed by classroom discussion and criticism. The place of the novel in our changing society; "ivory-tower" and "escape" novels; the novel as material for the screen.

Twelve sessions, Mondays, 8: 35 to 10 p. m., \$18.

First session, June 4.

Radiowriting: Comedy

Instructor: Abram S. Burrows.

Workshop course in comedy writing for radio. While the field of radio writing will be emphasized, consideration will also be given to comedy construction in the other writing fields. Assignments will be given to students and their work will be criticized in class. Guest lecturers will be introduced in some of the class sessions.

Twelve sessions, Mondays, 7 to 8: 30 p. m., \$18.

First session, June 4.

Radiowriting: Dramatic

Instructor: Bernard C. Schoenfeld.

A course in the fundamentals of radio. A combination of criticism, discussion, and lectures. Students will work on their own material. Special emphasis on the dramatic script.

Twelve sessions, Wednesdays, 7 to 8: 30 p. m., \$18.

First session, June 6.

Basic Journalism

Instructor: Michael Simmons.

Offering practical instruction for beginners, aiding and guiding those who aspire to enter the newspaper field; accent in these sessions will be on "know how," lectures being progressively supplemented by participation of students in the actual mechanics of writing for newspapers and going to press. Brief elementary assignments will be followed up by demonstration in layout and make-up, finishing with the printed edition of a newspaper in miniature.

Twelve sessions, Monday, 7 to 8: 30 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 4.

CINEMA

FOR THE PROFESSIONAL

Motion Picture Direction

Coordinator: Frank Tuttle.

Dealing with the specifics of film direction and production; analysis of script for shooting; break-down; casting; working with the actor; camera; dubbing and scoring; the approach of the writer, producer, and actor to the director. Registration limited to motion-picture professionals with some technical training.

Guest lecturers will include Edward Dmytryk, Vincent Sherman, James Wong Howe, Howard Estabrook, Herbert Biberman, Irving Pichel, Adrian Scott.

Twelve sessions, Thursdays, 8: 35 to 10 p. m., \$25.

First session, June 7.

FOR THE LAYMAN

"It's a good picture, but—" The Audience and the Picture Makers Get Together

Chairman: Alexander Knox.

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Knox, leading figures in the motion-picture industry—writers, actors, cameramen, set designers, directors, producers—will discuss their roles in the production of current films. The students will be encouraged to state their own reactions to the picture under consideration, and also to participate in the discussion following the lecture.

Six sessions, Fridays, 8: 30 to 10 p. m., \$3.

Date of first session to be announced.

PSYCHOLOGY

Psychology of Democracy and Fascism

Instructor: Frank C. Davis.

Modern approach to the understanding of the origin and functioning of social groups. Instinct vs. field-theoretical conceptions of group behavior. The emergence of the leader and the nature of his relationship to those whom he leads. Propaganda and the uses to which it is put. The specifically psychological problems confronting members of minority groups. "Caste" and "class" conceptions and their significance in democratic and Fascist societies. Individual, sex, and race differences in "intelligence." The question of who shall be educated. Democracy vs. fascistic educational purposes.

Twelve sessions, Thursday, 7 to 8:30 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 7.

Psychology of Personality

Instructor: Edward Joseph Shoben, Jr.

The relation between mental hygiene and personality development. The following topics will be considered: Nature, scope, and problems of mental hygiene. Classification of mental disorders: Neurosis, psychosis, and psychopathic personality. Growth of conscience with emphasis on infantile drives. Adolescence and its problems. Needs and their frustrations. Influence of society. Mental hygiene in marriage. Sex adjustments. Personality differences in children. The unmarried adult. Vocational adjustments. Techniques of self-therapy.

The course is planned for persons with limited knowledge of psychology.

Twelve sessions, Mondays, 7 to 8:30 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 4.

Training for Parenthood

Instructor: Lory Titelman.

A short course for prospective parents—mothers and fathers—to aid them in gaining insight into the problems of infancy. The following are among the topics which will be considered:

The infant—what is he like at birth?

Nursing—every baby's right, every mother's privilege.

Schedules—your baby as an individual human being.

First milestones—how to meet them.

Five sessions, Wednesdays, 7 to 8:30 p. m., \$3.

First session, June 20.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT: NURSERY YEARS

Courses of special interest to parents and teachers. Description of the emotional development of the small child during the most vital period of growth—from infancy to school age. An inquiry into the child's instinctual drives, his problems of adjustment, his playmates and his teachers. Analytic study of his relationship to his family. The sessions will include an examination of problems confronting members of the class, with contributing class discussion.

Child Development I

Introductory course; class limited to 25 students.

Instructors: Eleanor Francis and Marjorie Leonard.

Twelve sessions, Wednesdays, 8:35 to 10 p. m. \$6.

First session, June 6.

Child Development II

Instructor: Lory Titelman.

Advanced course relating the emotional, physical, and intellectual development of the child to everyday problems.

Prerequisite: Child Development I or equivalent.

Twelve sessions, Wednesdays, 8:35—10 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 6.

CHILDREN'S AND YOUNG PEOPLE'S COURSES

Chairman: Viola Spolin

Painting and drawing for young people

Age 11 and older.

Instructor: Eula Long.

A basic appreciation of art, and drawing techniques, in conjunction with design and color principles. The student will learn that art can be found in the shape of a cup, in the way a spoon is molded, in the colored stripes of a sweater. In this course the boy or girl will develop freedom of expression and an understanding of the place art has in his world.

Saturdays, 11-12:30.

Painting and drawing for children

Age 10 and younger.

Instructor: Jay Rivkin.

The program will teach techniques and media of drawing and painting, with the objective of developing the natural creative imagination of young children.

Saturdays, 11-12:30.

Rhythmic exercises for boys and girls

Age 11 and older.

Instructor: Jacobina Caro.

A body-technique course designed for young people. It combines creative corrective exercises with dramatic dance-patterns. The course aims towards the development of good posture, poise, and social adaptability.

Saturdays, 10-11.

Puppets for young people

Instructor: Mimi Login.

Students will design and build their own puppets and improvise puppet plays. They will also learn to manipulate puppets on improvised puppet stage. Professional puppeteers will be guest performers from time to time.

Saturdays, 11-12:30.

Dramatic play for young children

Age 10 and younger.

Instructor: Ruth Halpert, assisted by Shirley Gray.

Young children will have the experience of acting out their favorite rhymes and stories. Dramatic games and exercises will be part of a program planned to give the children a period of creative play in a dramatic activity.

Saturdays, 1-2:30.

Drama workshop

Ages 12-16.

Instructor: Viola Spolin.

Creative activities in the theater. Simple exercises and improvisation lead to a completed production for outside audiences. Opportunities in directing and staging plays. Drama workshop in a continuous activity; students may join the group at any time.

Day of week by arrangement with instructor.

RECREATIONAL THEATER

Recreational Theater I

Instructor: Viola Spolin.

Improvisation in drama—spontaneous "situation" exploitation points up primary theatrical lore. Workshop for dabblers and group planners.

Ten sessions, Wednesdays, 7-8:30 p. m., \$7.

First session, June 6.

Recreational Theater II

Instructor: Viola Spolin.

Advanced course. A combination of acting exercises and play production.

Fifteen sessions, Wednesdays, 8:30-10 p. m., \$15.

First session, May 16.

BODY TRAINING

Body Training for Women

Instructor: Jacobina Caro.

Corrective and reconditioning classes especially for women. Practical exercises designed for incorporation into the daily routine.

Twelve sessions, Mondays and Thursdays, 10:30-11:30 a. m., \$6.

First session, June 4.

Body Training for Actors

Instructor: Jacobina Caro.

A course for the student and professional actor encompassing posture, deportment, and general corrective exercises; problems in time and space; motivated rhythmic movement.

Twelve sessions, Thursdays, 7:30-8:30 p. m., \$6.

First session, June 7.

Body Training for Men and Women

Instructor: Jacobina Caro.

A system of exercises intended for incorporation into the daily routine of living; posture correction; practical uses of relaxation and tension.

Twelve sessions, Tuesdays, 8:35-9:30 p. m., \$6.

DANCE

Modern Dance: Elementary

Instructor: Harriette Anne Gray.

Elementary technique and body mechanics including rhythmic coordination and body control.

Twelve sessions, Tuesdays, 7:30-8:30 p. m., \$7.50.

First session, June 5.

Modern Dance: Advanced

Instructor: Harriette Anne Gray.

Open only to advanced dance students, the course will offer instruction in dance technique, studies in composition, and qualities and styles of dance movement.

Twelve sessions, two hours each, Thursdays, 8:30-10:30 p. m., \$15.

First session, June 7.

INSTRUCTORS AND GUEST LECTURERS

David Appleman: Ph. D., U. C.; now doing research and teaching soil science and plant physiology at UCLA.

Ralph Leon Beals: A. B., Ph. D., University of California; teaching fellow, research associate, lecturer, University of California; associate professor of anthropology, University of California at Los Angeles; museum technician, Field Division of Education, National Park Service; archeology director, Rainbow Bridge-Monument Valley expedition.

Herbert Biberman: B. S., University of Pennsylvania. Attended Baker's 47 workshop, Yale University, six months in the USSR studying the Soviet Theatre; four years with the Theatre Guild in New York as actor and director. Credits in the motion-picture industry as writer, writer of original stories, director, and now functioning as associate producer.

Leo Bigelman: Teacher and lecturer on social, economic, and political questions. Formerly associated with the Workers School of Los Angeles and numerous public journals.

Abram S. Burrows: Author and coproducer of Duffy's Tavern.

Jacobina Caro: Dance director, The Great John L. Sullivan; body training, Actors' Lab.

- Jules Carson: Taught labor journalism and economics at the Tom Mooney School, San Francisco. Two years dean of faculty and teacher at Commonwealth College. Taught economics at the California Labor School. Director, Alameda County P. A. C., C. I. O.
- Emma Lu Davis: Studied in Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts after finishing college. Has traveled widely and has exhibited all over world from New York to China. Artist in residence for three years, Reed College. Represented in Whitney Museum of American Art, New York. Currently doing experimental work with plastics.
- Frank C. Davis: Ph. D., U. C., 1931. Department of psychology at U. C. L. A., 1931-45. President, California State Federation of Teachers, A. F. L., 1942. Director of Education, People Educational Center.
- Peter De Lima: Noted radio commentator.
- Howard Dimsdale: Screen writer. Wrote shorts at MGM for three years, then features at MGM, Universal, and Columbia.
- Edward Dmytryk: Twenty years in the motion-picture industry including seven years of cutting experience and five years of direction. Currently at RKO. Recent pictures: Hitler's Children, Tender Comrade, Sister Kenny, Murder My Sweet, Invisible Army.
- Guy Endore: Author of the Werewolf Boris, Babouk, The Sword of God, The Known and Unknown Lives of Casanova, and the translator of several foreign classics. He is a contributor of articles and short stories to national publications.
- Neil Enochs: Director of research, Chinese-American Bureau of Research, Los Angeles.
- Eleanor Francis: Director, School for Nursery Years, Los Angeles.
- Meyer B. Frieden: B. A., U. C. L. A. Long experience in youth work. Formerly executive secretary, California Youth Legislature, so. division; representative Youth Division, Office of Civilian Defense; organizer, Young Communist League, Oakland, Calif. At present national council member, American Youth for Democracy, and Los Angeles executive secretary, A. Y. D.
- Sanford Goldner: Ph. D. in philosophy, UC; currently assistant research director in charge of Los Angeles office, California CIO council.
- Howard Gilhousen: Ph. D., U. C., 1930. Associate professor of psychology, U. C. L. A.
- Harriette Anne Gray: Concert dancer and teacher; graduate, Lindenwood College, Missouri; member, Humphrey Weidman dance group for five years. Taught at Bennington (Vt.) School of Dance; also Humphrey Weidman Studios, Perry Mansfield Camp, Whittier College, Stevens College.
- Shirley Gray: Six years' experience in little theatre. U. S. O. entertainer. Assistant director, A. Y. D. drama group.
- Alexandra Groth: Born in Russia; graduate, Bradford Academy, Bradford, Mass. Collaborated on articles for many periodicals dealing with education in the Soviet Union. Has taught Russian for fifteen years.
- Ruth Halpert: Teacher in elementary schools of Los Angeles. Summer camps teacher of dramatics for children.
- Thomas L. Harris: M. A., Cambridge University, England. Knows the Russian language and has been in constant touch with developments in the USSR. Minister of the Episcopal Church for fifteen years. Formerly national secretary, Council of American-Soviet Friendship.
- Harry Hoijer: Ph. D., University of Chicago, 1931. Instructor in anthropology, Univ. of Chicago, 1931-40. Assistant professor of anthropology, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Kenneth W. Howard: B. S., M. A., Harvard University. Teaching assistant, department of philosophy, Harvard. Business agent, AFL, 1939-44. Director of extension, PEC.
- Otto C. Jungwirth: Teacher of Spanish and German in L. A. day and evening high schools. Former vice president, adult education section, local 430, American Federation of Teachers.
- Alexander Knox: Eminent stage and motion-picture actor. Had title role in Wilson.
- John Howard Lawson: Author, Theory and Technique of Play Writing. Author of screen plays: Sahara, Action in the North Atlantic, Counter-Attack. Work in progress: a book on American history.

- Marjorie R. Leonard: Formerly director of the Child Study Center of Los Angeles. Psychologist and psychiatrist, specializing in work with children.
- Mini Logan: Artist and puppeteer. Toured Middle West with a puppet troupe. Arts and crafts director at summer camps. Graduate of American Artists School, New York. Studied with Anton Refregier.
- Eula Long: Graphic artist, exhibited at Metropolitan Museum, New York World's Fair, San Francisco Art Museum, Los Angeles County Museum, Artists for Victory show.
- Dean E. McHenry: Ph. D., University of California, 1936. Asst. professor political science, U. C. L. A.; coordinator, Navy training program. Recent writings: *A New Legislator for Modern California*, *California Government: Politics and Administration*. Has just completed study of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation of Canada.
- Katherine McTernan: Formerly teaching assistant, department of economics, University of California. Taught economics in the California Labor School in San Francisco.
- Ben Margolis: Member of the firm Katz, Gallagher & Margolis; former member of the firm of Gladstein, Grossman, Margolis & Sawyer, of San Francisco. Graduate of Hastings College of the Law, U. of C., 1933. Member of the executive board of the L. A. chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild.
- Bruce Minton: A. B., Harvard. An editor of *New Masses* magazine, 1935-36, 1938, 1940-41; Washington editor, 1941-44; at present west coast editor. Author of *Men Who Lead Labor*, and *The Fat Years and the Lean* in collaboration with John Stuart. Writer of screen originals with Ruth McKenney. Taught at New York School, League of American Writers.
- Alice Orans: Trained in executive and administration and community organization at New York School of Social Work; former executive assistant State relief administration, Los Angeles County; case supervisor, district director, Community Chest agencies.
- Viola Brothers Shore: Noted short-story writer and playwright. Represented in O'Brien's *Best Short Stories*.
- Mildred Raskin: Active in youth organizations from 1939-44. Former organizer for the United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO. Member of the National Council of the American Youth for Democracy. Administrative secretary of the Peoples Educational Association.
- Jay Rivkin: Artist with background of mural painting, ceramics, and illustration. Wide experience as teacher of children's classes.
- John Sanford: Author of the following novels, *The Waterwheel*, *The Old Man's Place*, *Seventy Times Seven*, *The People From Heaven*.
- Bernhard C. Schoenfeld: Author of *Johnny Appleseed* and 300 other radio programs. Pioneer in Government and wartime radio; Chief, Radio Section, OEM; Chief, Editorial Bureau, OWI. Work represented in many anthologies and texts.
- Edward Joseph Shoben, B. A., M. A. (University of Southern California): Practicing psychologist in Los Angeles.
- Michael Simmons: Formerly newspaper reporter, feature writer, magazine editor. Now a screen writer, author of 25 feature films.
- Viola Spolin: Taught dramatics, Hull House, Chicago, 4 years; organized an experimental theater for children; taught and supervised a teacher's training course in dramatics for several years at Recreational Training School, Chicago.
- Lory Titelman: Attended Columbia University in New York and Temple University, Philadelphia. Taught course for parents at Cooperative Nursery School at Santa Monica. Former director of Child Care Nursery School, Santa Monica.
- Frank Tuttle: Noted motion-picture director and writer.
- Michael Uris: Author of such stories for the screen as *Happy Go Lucky*, *I Married a Soldier*, *Listening Post*, and *The Life of President Masaryk*. Nine years of writing experience in pictures.
- Alvin Wilder: Noted radio commentator.
- Ralph Winstead: National representative, Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, CIO; investigator, La Follette Senate Civil Liberties Committee and for NLRB; veteran labor organizer.
- Leon Rene Yankwich, J. D. (Loyola University, Los Angeles), 1926; LL. D., 1929; Judge, Superior Court of Los Angeles County, 1927-35; judge, United States District Court of Southern District of California since 1935. Author of many books and articles on legal subjects.

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
7-8:30 p. m.	Basic Journalism. Psychology of Personality. Radio Writing: Comedy.	Modern Dance: Elementary (7:30-8:30). Russian I. Spanish I.	Radio Writing: Dramatic. Recreational. Theater I. Spanish III. Training for Parenthood.	Body Training for Actors (7:30-8:30). Psychology of Democracy and Fascism.		Rhythmic Exercises for Boys and Girls (10-11 a. m.). Painting and Drawing for Children (11 a. m.-12:30 p. m.).
8:35-10 p. m.	Modern Novel. Screen Writing I. Screen Writing II.	Body Training—Men and Women (8:35-9:30). Russian II. Spanish II.	Child Development I and II. Recreational. Theater II. Short Story II.	Modern Dance: Advanced (8:35-10:30). Motion Picture Direction.	Spanish II. "It's a Good Picture" (8:30-10).	Painting and Drawing for Young People (11 a. m.-12:30 p. m.). Puppets for Young People (11 a. m.-12:30 p. m.).
8-10 p. m.	One World.	China Today and Tomorrow. 60,000,000 Jobs.		Political Economy. Trade Union work-shop. World Perspectives. Body Training—Women.	History of American Labor. Principles and Practice of Organization.	Dramatic Play for Young Children (1-2:30 p. m.).
10:30-11:30 a. m.	Body Training—Women.					

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

President.....	Willis J. Hill
Vice President.....	Ralph Winstead
Treasurer.....	R. S. Avery

MEMBERS

Fay E. Allen	Dorothy Healey
R. S. Avery	Kenneth W. Howard
Mrs. Lowell Bigelow	Maurice Howard
Harry Brown	John Howard Lawson
Dr. Frank C. Davis	Dr. Dean E. McHenry
Frances Eisenberg	Bruce Minton
Mrs. Gertrude Flatte	C. T. Peterson
Tex Freeman	Albee Slade
Dr. Sanford Goldner	William Wolff
Frank Green	

STAFF

Administration Secretary.....	Mildred Raskin
Activities Director.....	Roberta Jones
Director of Education.....	Dr. Frank C. Davis
Director of Extension.....	Kenneth W. Howard
Director of Recreational Theater.....	Viola Spolin

PEOPLES EDUCATIONAL CENTER

1717 N. Vine St., Hollywood 28—HE 7263
124 W. 4th St., Rm. 486, Los Angeles 13—MU 3108

APPLICATION FOR ENROLLMENT

Please enroll me in the following classes:

Enclosed is my check (or money order) in payment of tuition and registration fees.

Name:
Street:
City:

Zone:
Telephone No.:

PEOPLES EDUCATIONAL CENTER

WINTER 1947

1717 N. Vine—Hollywood 28—Phone HO. 6291

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Willis J. Hill, *President*

Fay E. Allen	Dorothy Healey
Harry Brown	Maurice Howard
Dr. Frank C. Davis	John Howard Lawson
Sidney Davison	C. T. Peterson
Mrs. Gertrude Flatte	Albee Slade
Dr. Sanford Goldner	William Wolfe
Frank Green	

Sidney Davison, *Director*
Mildred Raskin, *Executive Secretary*
Martha Dones, *Registrar*

ADVISORY BOARD

Helmer Bergman
Dr. Leon Bigelman
Ed Gilbert
Sandra Gorney

Robert Lees
Frances Millington
Herbert Sorrell
Frank Tuttle

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword.

Calendar.

Curriculum:

The World Today
Psychology
Film—Radio—Writing
Languages—Art
Special Courses
Biographies
Class Schedules
Registration

Foreword.

Education of the People:

Because labor and the Hollywood community desire scientific, factual knowledge in the field of social sciences.

Because our democratic heritage of philosophy, literature, and the creative arts must be preserved.

Because the organization and unity of labor and all progressive forces are necessary for the achievement of a democratic nation and world based on freedom and security.

Education by the People:

Because our instructors are working men and women of the Hollywood community who are for the most part practicing professionals in their fields and who have volunteered their services.

Because they believe with Thomas Jefferson that "to educate and inform the whole mass of the people is the only sure reliance for the preservation of our liberty."

Education for the People:

Because there are no formal entrance requirements. The school is open to all regardless of race, creed, nationality, or political beliefs.

Because the Peoples Educational Center is a nonprofit school whose fees are low, to meet the needs of the average man or woman who works for a living.

Because the school's annual budget is met partly by student fees, partly by public lectures and forums, and for the rest depends upon contributions from people and organizations in the community who are in sympathy with its purpose and program.

WINTER TERM

CALENDAR

Registration begins Monday, Jan. 6, 1947.

Classes begin Monday, Jan. 20, 1947.

Entrance requirements

There are no formal entrance requirements. The school is open to all regardless of race, creed, nationality, or political beliefs. All students are required to complete registration history cards.

Registration

Registration will be accepted at the Center between 11 a. m. and 8 p. m. beginning Monday, January 6, 1947, and will continue until the end of the first week of school. Register early since most classes are limited in size. Mail registrations accompanied by tuition fees are acceptable. Staff members will be in attendance to advise prospective students.

Auditing

All classes with the exception of art, music, and lectures at the Screen Cartoonists Hall may be visited without charge the first session only.

School terms

Classes will meet weekly for ten 1½-hour sessions. They will be held at the Center, 1717 North Vine Street, except where otherwise indicated. During 1947, the terms will begin as follows:

Winter term, January 20, 1947.

Spring term, April 14, 1947.

Summer term, July 14, 1947.

Fall term, October 6, 1947.

Tuition fees

The regular fee for courses is \$6 for the term except where otherwise indicated. All fees are payable in full at time of registration. No fees are returnable unless a course is discontinued by the Center. A list of courses open to individual admission may be obtained from the Center.

Scholarships

Scholarships offered to union members and members of the armed forces must be applied for in writing to the registrar. College students, on presenting their students cards, will be accorded tuition reductions. Group rates are available to unions and organizations sending five or more students to the Center.

Transfers

A fee of \$1 is charged for a transfer of class. Transfers may not be made after the second session or to a class closed to registration.

The Student Council

The Student Council is an independent organization of student representatives from each class in the school. Educational and social activities of interest to the student body and to the general public are arranged and carried out through the council. The council publishes a student paper.

Forums and lecture series

The Center will conduct forums and arrange lecture series from time to time which will be open to students and the general public.

THE WORLD TODAY—REVIEW OF THE WEEK

Economics—Labor Problems—History

Sidney Davison.

Wednesday afternoon, 2:30–4 p. m.

Wednesday evening, 7–8:30 p. m.

This review of current events will analyze the most significant items in each week's news, tracing their historical background and discussing their meaning for the future. Particular attention will be paid to developments on the international scene. Chief emphasis then will be placed throughout on trends and tasks in the labor and progressive movements.

History of American Labor Movement

Milton Tyre.

Tuesday, 8:30 to 10 p. m.

The current American labor scene. Status of American trade-unions with emphasis upon their historical development. Background material and current status of unions and guilds in the motion-picture industry. An examination of America. Evolution of craft and industrial unionism—forms and techniques. The position of trade-unions in the economy of the country from the beginnings of the organized labor movement to the present day.

Labor's Key Problems

Helmer Bergman, William B. Esterman, Charles Gladstone, Victor Kaplan, Frank Pestana, and others.

Wednesday, 8:30 to 10 p. m.

Organized labor, though a section of the working class and of the people, by its actions and achievements sets a pattern which affects all the people. The new problems labor is facing as a result of the 1946 elections are of importance

to all, whether they belong to unions or not. There are openly proclaimed plans to repeal or at least amend the Wagner Act, to prevent national agreements, and to hamper labor's legitimate activities in a multitude of ways. The role of the NLRB, the import of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the renewed use of injunctions in industrial disputes, the police attacks against picket lines necessitate a reexamination of the economic-political scene from the workers' viewpoint. This course will analyze these key trends in the labor scene today and will also discuss the shop steward system, strikes and strike strategy, your rights as a striker, what to do when under arrest, etc. The lecturers will be drawn from among shop stewards, trade-union leaders, and labor attorneys.

Public Speaking and Parliamentary Law

Wallace Stark.

Wednesday, 7 to 8:30 p. m.

Every member of an organization or trade-union should be able to speak from the floor, deliver a talk or report, and act as chairman of a discussion or meeting. This course will help the student do a better job of speaking before groups of people. It will be a practical course, based on the needs of the students. Individual practice and criticism will be given. Main aspects of parliamentary procedure will be discussed and applied.

Office Organization and Mimeographing

Tuition—Section I, \$5; section II, \$3. Combined tuition, \$6.

Monday, 7 to 8:30 p. m.

This is a laboratory course in two sections designed to fill the needs of office staffs of trade-unions and other organizations.

Section II. Office Organization

George Beller.

Begins January 20.

The material for discussion will be: How to install a simple and easily controlled set of books, account properly for all expenditures, maintain a petty cash fund, make a bank reconciliation, and account for parties and affairs. The course will stress current weaknesses in many offices and problems that office personnel face today. Six sessions.

Section II. Mimeograph Techniques

Ted Filien, Herbert Klynn, and Mildred Raskin.

Begins March 3.

This section is designed to improve the quality of mimeographed material. The instructors are experts in their fields. Lay-out, art work, color work, the use of the stylus, and the functioning of the machine will be covered. Students will make lay-outs and cut and run their own stencils. Four sessions.

China, India, the Colonial World

Neil Enoch, coordinator; Marshall Ho'o, Lai Singh, and others.

Wednesday, 8:30 to 10 p. m.

An analytical course that will give background and current development in the entire area of the Pacific Basin. China—its history since the 1911 revolution, the role of Chiang Kai-shek, the Communist forces, the Liberal-Democratic forces, United States imperialism in China. The struggle for independence in India, the Dutch East Indies, current status of the Philippines. Japan as the industrial reservoir of imperialism in the Far East. Discussions on the colonial struggles in Africa, the Middle East, and Palestine. Changing balance of forces between the United States and Great Britain. Role of the Soviet Union.

The Jewish People Yesterday and Today

Instructor to be announced.

Tuesday, 7-8:30 p. m.

The major social, economic, and political forces that shaped Jewish life; the recurrence of anti-Semitism through the ages—its causes and methods of combatting it; the influence of the ghetto on Jewish life. The "Emancipation" period beginning with the French Revolution; Jewish life in the 19th century. The development of Palestine and the current scene; Jewish life today in the U. S. S. R., Poland, and postwar Europe. The position of the Jew in America.

The Soviet Union, a New Civilization

Thursday, 8:30-10 p. m.

A seminar type course which will discuss the social, economic, and political structure of the U. S. S. R. Topics to be discussed will include: Man as a citizen of a planned society—social security, health insurance, etc.; education; science in Soviet society; trade-unions under socialism; art and culture; national minority relationships; the Soviet Union and the UNO.

Marriage in Today's World

Dr. Jack Agins in collaboration with Dr. Leo Bigelman, Dr. Frank Davis, and Mrs. Lory Titelman.

Thursday, 8:30-10 p. m.

Marriages may or may not be made in heaven, but they can be happy. Difficulties and problems that arise can be resolved if adequate information is available. The aim of the course will be to offer a scientific presentation of all factors involved. It will deal with the physiology of marriage; the psychological and psychiatric aspects; the social and economic scene today in its relationship to marriage and the home; and the adjustments when children first arrive. It is planned to provide ample time for questions and discussion. The instructors are medical doctors and trained psychologists.

Medical Science Facts and Fallacies

Dr. Frederick.

Friday, 8:30-10 p. m.

A lecture and discussion course which will analyze a number of outstanding health problems and indicate how they affect you. Lectures are trained professionals, specialists in their various fields, who will present the latest scientific findings in a popular way for the layman, with exposure throughout of current superstitions, cure-alls, and quackery. Specific diseases and treatments will be discussed. Availability of medical care, compulsory health insurance, and preventive medicine will be surveyed from a social point of view.

What Is Philosophy

Instructor to be announced.

Monday, 7-8:30 p. m.

The course is designed for the person with no previous formal knowledge of philosophy. It will deal with philosophy as a way of understanding the world we live in rather than as an academic subject concerned with "systems." The class will be devoted largely to directed discussion dealing with the major problems of today, with continual reference to the solutions offered by the great philosophers of the past and present, including Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Spinoza, Berkeley, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Marx, Russell, Dewey, and others. The class will investigate the relationships of mind and matter, knowledge and reality, philosophy and science, idealism and materialism, metaphysics and dialectics. Such questions will be discussed in terms of the experience and vocabulary of the class itself.

Development of Society

Frank Thomas.

Wednesday, 7-8:30 p. m.

This course is an introduction to the scientific study of social change. It will develop the theoretical background for the analysis of current problems. Topics will include: Origin and development of capitalism; character and perspectives of imperialism; the nature and objectives of fascism; the theory and practice of socialism; the state in modern society; the modern labor movement; the United Nations and problems of world security.

Political Economy

Instructor to be announced.

Political economy is a three-semester (30 weeks) course which must be taken in sequence.

Semester I, Tuesday, 7-8:30 p. m.

This course will present the Marxist analysis of capitalist economy. Among the questions to be discussed are: How did capitalism originate? What are commodities, and what determines their value? How is price related to value? What is the source of profit? What is the relationship between wages, prices, and profits?

Dr. Leon Bigelman.

Semester II, Tuesday, 8:30-10 p. m.

This course will continue the analysis of capitalist economy. Among the topics to be discussed are: Factors determining the rate of profit; profit; interest and banking; the nature of rent; the development of agriculture in capitalist society; the character and origins of economic crises.

Frank Thomas.

Semester III, Wednesday, 8:30-10 p. m.

This course will deal with the principles and laws of political economy as they operate in this epoch of monopoly capitalism. Among the topics to be discussed are: The nature and practice of monopoly capital; financial capital; the export of capital; the character of colonial exploitation; international cartels; problems of world trade and the economic rivalry of imperialist powers; imperialist war; imperialism and fascism.

Psychology—Psychology of Everyday Living

Rose N. Marshall.

Friday, 7-8:30 p. m.

A presentation of some basic psychological concepts which motivate human behavior. Will give an approach to the study of human adjustments. Topics will include scientific methods applied to human problems, the origin of the family, family relationships, and sex and marriage. Lecture and group discussion method.

Child Development Courses

The courses are planned to be of equal interest to parents, teachers, and everyone specializing in child care. They will discuss the behavior and emotional development of the child through infancy, early childhood, and the school years. They will indicate the practical applications of the findings of outstanding psychologists.

The Preschool Child

This course will be given in the spring term. It will concern itself with the child from infancy to 6 years. Included in the discussion will be such things as the child and the family; the child in his neighborhood; such problems as sibling rivalry, social adjustments, bed wetting, fears, and night terrors.

The School-Age Child

Marjorie Leonard.

Monday, 8:30-10 p. m.

The child through the years from six to twelve. Will treat his present personality adjustment as the result of his early training, his conflicts, typical adolescent situations we can anticipate. The discussions will include classroom difficulties resulting from conflicts in the home; what recreation for children (comics, radio, movies); what education should we demand for our children?

Film Studio Writing

While there is no substitute for talent, where talent does not exist, it can be aided in its expression by experienced criticism and advice.

Motion-Picture Direction

Irving Pichel, coordinator.

Thursday, 8:30-10 p. m.

Tuition, \$25.

Dealing with the specifics of film direction and production; analysis of script for shooting; break-down; casting; working with the actor; camera; dubbing and scoring; the approach of the writer, producer, and actor to the director. Lectures will be as follows:

Story Preparation, Herbert Biberman.

Production Preparation, Vincent Sherman.

On the Set, Frank Tuttle.

Acting, to be announced.

Acting, Irving Pichel.

Camera, Paul Ivano.

Cutting, Edward Dmytryk.

Production, Kenneth Macgowan.

Music, Hugo Friedhofer.

Summary, Irving Pichel.

The Motion Pictures—Illusion and Reality

Ben Barzman, Karen Morley, Arnold Manoff, and others.

Tuesday, 8:35–10 p. m.

Tuition, \$6. Single session, \$1.

Will survey the main aspects of motion pictures today as an industry and as an art form. The topics to be discussed will include: How is a picture made? What do producers, actors, writers, directors, cutters, musicians, etc., do? What is the history of the films from the days of the "flickers" to sound and color today? Who owns the industry? Who controls it? How is content determined? What is the role of censorship? Why the star system? The current status of the guilds and unions. The role of motion pictures in international politics.

The lecturers will be drawn from among prominent practicing professionals in the field.

Will be held at the Screen Cartoonists Hall, 6272 Yucca, corner Vine.

Screen Writing

The screen-writing program is set up in three semesters. The school recognizes the fact that there can be no substitute for actual writing in the learning of this craft; however, the courses are designed to give basic instruction and guidance to the serious student of screen writing. It is urged that the student devote as much time as possible to outside writing in addition to class work. There will be a definite progression of work in each class and, except in those cases where the student can show that he is more advanced, he will be required to take the courses in order.

Screen Writing I

Robert Lees.

Thursday, 7–8:30 p. m.

Tuition, \$21.50.

The lecture course on the basic approach to writing for the screen. The class will include discussions of elements of the story, theme, idea, character, construction, motivation, suspense, humor, visual technique, continuity, dialogue, marketing, etc. Twenty Best Film Plays, by Gassner and Nichols, will be used as textbook.

Screen Writing II

Val Burton.

Monday, 8:30–10 p. m.

Tuition, \$18.

A workshop course in the practical application of the principles learned in Screen Writing.

I. The class will create and develop a specific screen story as a group project. In discussion and with the guidance of the instructor, the class will construct a story outline, build characters, and write scenes. Emphasis will be on the application in practice of the basic material which was presented in Screen Writing I.

Prerequisite, Screen Writing I.

Screen Writing III

Stanley Rubin.

Tuesday 8:30–10 p. m.

Tuition \$18.

A workshop course in the preparation of original stories for the screen. Students will develop their own material under the guidance of the instructor and with the help of class discussions. Production of material will be slanted toward current markets. Enrollment limited. Admission will be on the basis of submission of current writing, screen or other, and interview, or in exceptional cases, interview alone.

Radio Speech Technics

Vocha Fiske.

Monday, 7–8:30 p. m.

Tuition, \$18.

An introductory course for nonprofessionals. Active group and individual participation for (a) general social orientation to radio; (b) basic mike and

speech practice for public-address systems and broadcasting; (c) adequate line reading; and (d) program-projects for community education. Emphasis, not on personality exploitation or professional contracts, but upon acquiring communicative skill.

Radio Writing Comedy

Louis Quinn.

Tuesday, 7-8:30 p. m.

Tuition, \$18.

A workshop course in radio comedy analysis and writing. It will cover all types of comedy shows—situation comedy, gag writing, monologues, writing for guest stars, and variety writing. Emphasis throughout will be on specific assignments oriented towards current shows and stars.

Creative Writing and Composition

Monday, 8:30-10 p. m.

Tuition, \$6.

A general course designed for those who are interested in writing but who are lacking in experience. Grammar will be discussed to meet the individual's needs. A wide latitude of subject matter will be allowed. There will be writing assignments and class criticism and discussion of material submitted.

Basic Journalism

Michael Simmons.

Monday, 7-8:30 p. m.

Tuition, \$6.

A workshop course offering practical instruction for those who aspire to enter the newspaper field, or who desire to master techniques which will aid them in handling publicity for clubs, trade-unions, organizations, etc. Lectures will be supplemented by brief assignments, interviews, and press conferences with opportunities for apt students to achieve publication. Demonstrations in lay-out, make-up, and the mechanics of going to press.

Advertising Copy Writing

Helen Alcalay.

Friday, 8:30-10 p. m.

Tuition, \$18.

A workshop and open-forum course on advertising copy writing, covering the techniques employed in radio commercials, direct-mail pieces, magazine and newspaper advertising. Class assignments will include retail copy (with emphasis on fashions) and national campaigns (foods, cosmetics, automobiles, etc.). Lectures will include ethics, Government regulations, copy trends.

Modern Novel

Guy Endore and John Sanford.

Friday, 8:30-10 p. m.

Tuition, \$18.

Designed as a workshop course for serious students. An analysis of form, structure, plot, character, theme. Reading from students' work in progress, followed by classroom discussion and criticism. The place of the novel in our changing society; "ivory-tower" and "escape" novels; the novel as material for the screen.

Short Story

Wilma Shore.

Tuesday, 7:30-8:30 p. m.

Tuition, \$18.

A workshop course. Analysis of students' stories by the class and the teacher, individual criticism, discussion of short-story technique on the basis of submitted work. Form and content of short story considered in their dynamic relationship. A realistic approach to problems of marketing.

Modern Play Writing

Charles B. Millholland.
Friday, 7-8:30 p. m.
Tuition, \$18.

A workshop course based on class assignments and work submitted by students. The course will cover the one-act play; form and structure of the play, character development; effective disguise; the role of "conflict"; special techniques and demands of the theatre. Discussion will center about class criticism of students' work.

Language Art: Spanish I

Gladys Magy.
Thursday, 8:30-10 p. m.
Tuition, \$7.50.

A practical conversational course for beginners. The instructor will follow the methods used in the Berlitz language schools. The emphasis will be on reading and writing leading to an ability to read newspapers and the heritage of Yiddish literature.

Spanish II

Gladys Magy.
Thursday, 7-8:30 p. m.
Tuition, \$7.50.

An intermediate course in practical Spanish for Americans. A continuation of the course given last semester. Conversational Spanish will be stressed in conjunction with more advanced grammar, reading, and writing.

Russian I

Lillya Sabsay.
Thursday, 8:30-10 p. m.
Tuition, \$7.50.

Practical Russian for Americans, emphasis throughout will be on conversational Russian. Elementary reading and writing will be given.

Russian II

Lillya Sabsay.
Thursday, 7-8:30 p. m.
Tuition, \$7.50.

An intermediate course in practical Russian for Americans. A continuation of the course given last semester. Conversational Russian will be stressed in conjunction with more advanced grammar, reading, and writing.

Yiddish

Freda Minowitz.
Thursday, 7-8:30 p. m.
Tuition, \$7.50.

This course is designed for students with an elementary conversational knowledge of the Yiddish language. The history and development of the Yiddish language will be discussed. Emphasis will be on reading and writing leading to an ability to read newspapers and the heritage of Yiddish literature.

Art Yesterday and Today—an Appreciation Course

Moi Solotaroff.
Friday, 7-8:30 p. m.

Toward an understanding of the developments in painting from the mid-19th century until today; emphasizing the unique contributions of each school—the impressionists, postimpressionists, Fauves, cubists, dadaists, abstractionists, expressionists, and surrealists—the new forms they discovered, the social roots of their expression, and their background in cultural history.

Drawing for beginners

Emma Lon Davis.
Monday, 8-10 p. m.
Tuition, \$10.

For the person who has always wanted to draw but has feared setting pencil to paper. The purpose of this course is to relax the beginner's tension and

timidity and to teach him fundamentals of line, color, and arrangement. Breadth and freedom and imaginative treatment are stressed. Much of the subject matter is abstract because abstraction is easier for a beginner. Will deal with the simpler problems of representational drawing, perspective, how light and shadow fall on objects.

Class limited to 15. Will be held outside the center. Registration prior to first class is essential. Students will supply own drawing materials.

Still life and pictorial composition—a painting course

Ted Gillen.

Tuesday, 8–10 p. m.

Tuition, \$10.

A course primarily designed to stimulate the student to the creative and imaginative possibilities of painting pictures and finding self-expression through knowledge of basic principles and technics. Various media will be utilized with the emphasis on oils.

Class limited to 15. Will be held outside the center. Registration prior to first class is essential. Students will supply own painting materials.

Portraiture

Joseph Chabot.

Monday and Tuesday, 8–10 p. m.

Tuition: Five weeks, \$12.50.

Tuition: Ten weeks, \$20, payable in advance.

This class will be held twice weekly, Mondays and Tuesdays. Students may enroll for five weeks or for the full ten-week course.

Drawing and painting as direct interpretative medium, with accent on portraiture for both beginners and advanced students. Procedure will be through the use of lectures, demonstrations, and drawing and painting from models. Preliminary training is not essential as instruction is individual.

Class limited to 12. Will be held outside the center. Registration prior to first class is essential. Students will supply own drawing materials.

Life class

Leon Saulter.

Wednesday, 8–10 p. m.

Tuition, \$15.

A figure is a wonderful object to draw because it offers so many possibilities for development. The aim will be: How can we get a drawing rather than a mere anatomical representation from the experience of seeing the model? The emphasis will be placed on the individual reaction to the model rather than on the drawing of a representational or academic picture. Various media will be utilized.

Class limited to 15. Will be held outside the center. Registration prior to first class is essential. Students will supply own drawing materials.

Ceramics for beginners

Paquerette Pathe.

Saturday, 10–12 a. m.

Tuition, \$15.

A workshop course emphasizing creative modeling in clay. The technics of making pottery and art objects, including decoration, glazing, and firing will be studied and practiced. All supplies will be furnished.

Class limited to 12. Will be held outside the center. Registration prior to first class is essential.

SPECIAL COURSES

Shorthand

Alice Miles.

Classes will meet three times weekly, Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday, 7:45 to 9:45 p. m.

Tuition, \$25; may be paid in three installments:

January 20	-----	\$10
February 3	-----	10
February 17	-----	5

An accelerated method of planned instruction in Gregg shorthand. This will be an intensive course which, in 60 hours of instruction, should teach the beginner to do 70 or more words per minute. Will be oriented towards work in motion pictures and radio.

Students must be able to type.

Will be held outside the center.

Body Building and Dance I

Paquerette Pathe.

Monday, 8:30-10 p. m.

Tuition, \$10.

A course designed for relaxation, enjoyment, and the personal experience of various forms in the dance. It will include body building, pantomime, folk dancing, and modern and ballet techniques. It is for those who do not intend to aim at a professional career in the dance field.

This class will be held outside the center.

Body Building and Dance—Advanced

Paquerette Pathe.

Monday, 7-8:30 p. m.

Tuition, \$10.

A course designed for those who have had Miss Pathe's course or who have had other dance training. Technic on a more advanced level, elements of choreography for individuals and groups, advanced pantomime.

This class will be held outside the center.

Music as Communication

Laurence Morton.

Tuesday, 8-9:30 p. m.

Tuition, \$5.

These lectures will explore the avenues of communication between composers and their audiences, and will attempt to reconcile the aesthetic attitude in listening to music with the musicological and sociological attitudes. Discussions will deal with the internal facts of music (substance, form, and structure); with the external facts about music (history, customs, fashions, and social forces); and with the relationships that make each the context for the other. The aim of the course is to encourage an intelligent listening attitude receptive to the ideas proclaimed in great music.

Class will be limited in size. Will be held in a private home. This will be a five-session class. Registration prior to first class is essential.

What is This Thing Called Jazz?

Elliott Grennard.

Friday, 8:35-10 p. m.

Tuition, \$6. Single admission, \$1.

The serious jazz musicians themselves, in spite of their various approaches to the sources of inspiration, steadfastly go about their business of making the music, resolving their creative problems as they go. It is the serious listener who is vexed by all manner of doubts. Is jazz America's musical language, or is it a dialect? At what point does it become "commercial"? Does it have any connection with Tin Pan Alley and "popular songs"? Is there such a thing as "arranged" jazz, or must it be improvised? Is "jive" its spoken language and "jitterbugging" its physical expression? And where does Frank Sinatra fit in? Harry James? Guy Lombardo? Or did jazz really die with King Oliver and Jelly Roll Morton? Lectures will be illustrated with recordings.

Will be held at the Screen Cartoonist's Hall, 6272 Yucca Street.

BIOGRAPHIES

Jack Agins, M. D.: Has practiced gynecology and obstetrics for many years. Was editor of several medical journals in Michigan and an officer of the Wayne County Medical Association. Has lectured to university and lay audiences on the general topic of family and domestic relations.

Minna Agins: Born in the Ukraine, lived and received early education in the Far East. Attended Columbia University; B. A. from Cornell University. Has lectured widely on the Soviet Union.

- Helen Alcalay: Advertising agency copy writer. Has written food, fashion, cosmetic, automotive, drug, soap, cleanser, and used-car copy. Responsible for some of the most infuriating singing commercials on the air—but don't admit which ones.
- George Beller: Accountant, auditor, and business manager.
- Helmer W. Bergman: Labor leader for many years; member of IBEW-40 A. F. of L.; chairman, Motion Picture Stewards Council.
- Herbert Biberman: B. S., University of Pennsylvania. Attended Baker's 47 workshop, Yale University. Credits in the motion-picture industry as writer of original stories, director, and is now associate producer.
- Leo Bigelman, M. D.: Teacher and lecturer on social, economic, and political questions. Formerly associated with the Workers School of Los Angeles and numerous public forums.
- Val Burton: Writer-producer at Universal. Among his screen credits are: Lord Jeff, On Their Own, the entire Henry Aldrich series, Glamor Boy, True to the Army, Passport to Adventure.
- Hugh Campbell: M. A., Berkeley. Has taught English for several years.
- Joseph Chabot: Runner-up in the 1936 Chalonier prize competition in Paris and has received numerous prizes in other contests. Worked for three years with the Red Cross rehabilitation program.
- Emma Lou Davis: Sculptor-painter. Made several large sculptures for Federal Section of Fine Arts; resident artist at Reed College for three years. Represented in Whitney Museum in New York. Now designing and manufacturing lamps, toys, and furniture.
- Sidney Davison: Director of the Peoples Educational Center; B. A., College of the City of New York; has taught and lectured on social subjects for a period of years. Was in the United States Navy for four years.
- Frank C. Davis: Ph. D., University of California 1931. Department of psychology at University of California at Los Angeles 1931-45. Former director of education, Peoples Educational Center. Currently in private practice as a consulting psychologist.
- Guy Endore: Author of Babouk, The Sword of God, The Known and Unknown Lives of Cassanova; translator of several foreign classics. Contributor of articles and short stories to national publications. Coauthor of screen play G. I. Joe. Author of best seller Methinks the Lady.
- Neil Enochs: Director of research, Chinese-American Bureau of Research. Former editor of Los Angeles Chinese Review. Authority on colonial affairs; former newspaperman, lecturer, and writer. Work in progress; Indian Policy—a History of United States Indian-White Relations.
- William B. Esterman: Labor attorney, member of law firm of Pestana & Esterman; attorney for Conference of Studio Unions.
- Vocha Fiske: Has taught radio technics at University of California, Berkeley; University of California at Los Angeles summer sessions; and Los Angeles City College; 1946 instructor for A. F. R. A.'s veteran refresher course.
- Hugo Friedhofer: Been composing and arranging for major studios since the inception of sound. Has been orchestrator for Steiner and Korngold. Received the 1945-46 best film score award from National Film Music Council for score of Bandit of Sherwood Forest.
- Ted Gilien: Formerly combat artist, United States Army, covering Southwest Pacific, Philippines, and Japan; painted Government murals; studied at National Academy of Art and Art Students League, New York. Exhibiting at American Contemporary Gallery.
- Elliott Grennard: Has played piano professionally in bands, member of ASCAP; articles on jazz in Music and Rhythm, PM, and New Masses; for three years was music editor and critic of Billboard. Now writing fiction and is taking time out for book on jazz—its main points will furnish basis of his lecture series.
- Victor Kaplan: Labor attorney, member of law firm of Katz, Gallagher, and Margolis.
- Herbert Klynn: Cartoonist at present time. Commercial artists; had own advertising agency.
- Robert Lees: Has been actively writing in motion picture industry for 12 years. For the past 3 years has been under contract to Paramount. Latest credit: Abbott and Costello, Buck Privates Come Home.

- Marjorie Leonard: B. A. from U. C. L. A.; graduate work at University of Berlin and Stanford University; studied psychoanalysis at Institute of Psychoanalysis, Berlin. Former director of the Child Study Center of Los Angeles. Psychologist and psychoanalyst specializing in work with children.
- Kenneth MacGowan: Dramatic critic from 1910 to 1923; play producer from 1923 to 1931; motion-picture producer since 1932. Screen credits include: *Easy Come Easy Go*, *Life Boat*, *Happy Lands*, *In Old Chicago*, and *Little Woman*. Head of theater arts department at U. C. L. A.
- Gladys Magy: B. A., Oberlin College; M. A. in Spanish from N. Y. U. Worked in Office of Inter-American Affairs.
- Rose N. Marshall: University of Michigan; M. S. W. from Smith College School of Social Work. Twelve years' experience in New York and in military hospitals as therapist with both children and adults. Currently in private practice as an adult and child therapist.
- Alice Miles: Had own secretarial school in Santa Barbara. Has taught own adaptation of Gregg shorthand in public schools and for the Army and Navy during the war.
- Charles B. Millholland: His play about Tolstoi, *The Green Stick*, won a prize; acted lead in own play about Nijinsky, *Faun*, at Indianapolis Civic Theater. Adapted his brother's book to the screen as *Submarine Patrol*. Author of stage, screen, and radio success, *Twentieth Century*.
- Freda Minowitz: Taught for Hillel Foundation in New York. Was on faculty of Yiddish Scientific Institute and member of Jewish Education Committee of New York.
- Laurence Morton: Has done orchestrating for major studios and radio networks. Music critic for Script magazine. Correspondent for *Modern Music*. Has had articles in *Hollywood Quarterly*.
- Louis Quinn: Radio writer for Radio Hall of Fame and Orson Welles. Two years of writing and directing for Blue Network, in Hollywood.
- Paquerette Pathe: Dancer and dancing teacher; was with Jooss Ballet. Has taught in Los Angeles for many years. Established own ceramics studio and factory 2 years ago.
- Frank Pestana: Labor attorney, senior member of law firm of Pestana and Esterman; attorney for the C. S. U.
- Irvin Pichel: Motion-picture director. Has been prominent for many years in the New York stage. Has been both an actor and director in cinema. Recently directed the *Bride Wore Boots*.
- Stanley Rubin: Has written for Columbia Workshop, been writing for motion pictures since 1939. Has 15 credits for originals and screen plays. Wrote, directed, and produced Army films. Produced at Universal. Now under contract at Columbia.
- Mildred Raskin: Executive secretary, Peoples Educational Center.
- Lillya Sabsay: Born in the Crimea; has taught private classes in Russian; a commercial artist at the present time.
- John Sanford: Graduated from DeWitt Clinton High School in New York; LL. B. from Fordham University; practiced law in New York for a number of years. Author of following novels: *The Waterwheel*, *the Old Man's Place*, *Seventy Times Seven*, *the People From Heaven*.
- Leon Sauter: Has been a sculptor for 15 years. Shows in American Contemporary Gallery, L. A. County Museum, and other local galleries.
- Wilma Shore: Short stories published in *Story*, *New Masses*, *McCall's*, *Accent*, and *Good Housekeeping*. Represented in *O'Brien's Best Short Stories of 1941*.
- Michael Simmons: Former newspaper reporter, feature writer, magazine editor. Now a screen writer; author of 25 feature films.
- Moi Solotaroff: Artist, stage designer, teacher, and lecturer. Was director of the *Solo Collective*, New York.
- Frank Thomas: Majored in sociology and chemistry at Temple University. Has taught and lectured on social subjects.
- Milton Tyre: Labor attorney, member of law firm of Katz, Gallagher, and Margolis.

CLASS SCHEDULES, WINTER 1947

Monday :

7-8:30:

What Is Philosophy?
 Basic Journalism.
 Office Organization and Mimeographing.
 Radio Speech Technics.
 Dance, Advanced.

8:30-10:

Screen Writing II.
 Creative Writing.
 School Age Child.
 Dance I.

7:45-9:45:

Shorthand.

8-10:

Beginning Drawing.
 Portraiture.

Tuesday :

7-8:30:

Jewish People Yesterday and Today.
 Radio Comedy Writing.
 Political Economy I.

8:30-10:

Political Economy II.
 Short Story.
 History of American Labor.
 Motion Pictures.
 Screen Writing III.
 Illusion and Reality.

7:45-9:45:

Shorthand.

8-10:

Still Life and Pictorial.
 Composition.
 Portraiture.

8-9:30:

Music as Communication.

Wednesday :

7-8:30:

Development of Society.
 Review of the Week.
 Public Speaking.

8:30-10:

Political Economy III.
 China—India—Colonial World.
 Labor's Key Problems.

8-10:

Life Class.

2:30-4:

Review of the Week.

Thursday :

8:30-10:

Yiddish.
 Screen Writing I
 Russian II.
 Spanish II.

7:30-8:30:

The Soviet Union—a New Civilization.
 Marriage in Today's World.
 Motion-Picture Direction.
 Russian I.
 Spanish I.

7:45-9:45:

Shorthand.

CLASS SCHEDULES, WINTER 1947—continued

Friday:

7-8:30:

Art—Yesterday and Today.

Psychology of Everyday.

Living.

Playwriting.

8:30-10:

Advertising Copywriting.

Medical Science.

Facts and Fallacies.

Modern Novel.

What Is This Thing Called Jazz.

Saturday:

10 a. m.—12 m.:

Ceramics.

I hereby enroll for courses in

Name:

Miss

Mrs.

Mr.

Address:

City:

Zone:

Phone:

Occupation:

Affiliations:

I learned of the center through—

Advertising:

Circular:

Friend:

I am a former student of PEC ———.

I am enclosing a check or money order for \$——.

(Layout and typography by Paul Levine)

The CHAIRMAN. We stand recessed now until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:25 p. m., the hearing was recessed until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Walt Disney is the first witness, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Disney, will you stand and raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give shall be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. DISNEY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF WALTER E. DISNEY

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Disney, will you state your full name and present address, please?

Mr. DISNEY. Walter E. Disney, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Disney?

Mr. DISNEY. Chicago, Ill., December 5, 1901.

Mr. STRIPLING. December 5, 1901?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I am a producer of motion-picture cartoons.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the interrogation of Mr. Disney will be done by Mr. Smith.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Disney, how long have you been in that business?

Mr. DISNEY. Since 1920.

Mr. SMITH. You have been in Hollywood during this time?

Mr. DISNEY. I have been in Hollywood since 1923.

Mr. SMITH. At the present time you own and operate the Walt Disney Studio at Burbank, Calif.?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I am one of the owners. Part owner.

Mr. SMITH. How many people are employed there, approximately?

Mr. DISNEY. At the present time about 600.

Mr. SMITH. And what is the approximate largest number of employees you have had in the studio?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, close to 1,400 at times.

Mr. SMITH. Will you tell us a little about the nature of this particular studio, the type of pictures you make, and approximately how many per year?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, mainly cartoon films. We make about 20 short subjects, and about 2 features a year.

Mr. SMITH. Will you talk just a little louder, Mr. Disney?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SMITH. How many, did you say?

Mr. DISNEY. About 20 short subject cartoons and about 2 features per year.

Mr. SMITH. And some of the characters in the films consist of—

Mr. DISNEY. You mean such as Mickey Mouse and Donald Duck and Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, and things of that sort.

Mr. SMITH. Where are these films distributed?

Mr. DISNEY. All over the world.

Mr. SMITH. In all countries of the world?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, except the Russian countries.

Mr. SMITH. Why aren't they distributed in Russia, Mr. Disney?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, we can't do business with them.

Mr. SMITH. What do you mean by that?

Mr. DISNEY. Oh, well, we have sold them some films a good many years ago. They bought the Three Little Pigs and used it through Russia. And they looked at a lot of our pictures, and I think they ran a lot of them in Russia, but then turned them back to us and said they didn't want them, they didn't suit their purposes.

Mr. SMITH. Is the dialogue in these films translated into the various foreign languages?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes. On one film we did 10 foreign versions. That was Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs.

Mr. SMITH. Have you ever made any pictures in your studio that contained propaganda and that were propaganda films?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, during the war we did. We made quite a few—working with different Government agencies. We did one for the Treasury on taxes and I did four anti-Hitler films. And I did one on my own for Air Power.

Mr. SMITH. From those pictures that you made have you any opinion as to whether or not the films can be used effectively to disseminate propaganda?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, I think they proved that.

Mr. SMITH. How do you arrive at that conclusion?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, on the one for the Treasury on taxes, it was to let the people know that taxes were important in the war effort. As they explained to me, they had 13,000,000 new taxpayers, people who had never paid taxes, and they explained that it would be impossible to prosecute all those that were delinquent and they wanted to put this story before those people so they would get their taxes in early. I made the film and after the film had its run the Gallup poll organization polled the public and the findings were that 29 percent of the people admitted that had influenced them in getting their taxes in early and giving them a picture of what taxes will do.

Mr. SMITH. Aside from those pictures you made during the war, have you made any other pictures, or do you permit pictures to be made at your studio containing propaganda?

Mr. DISNEY. No; we never have. During the war we thought it was a different thing. It was the first time we ever allowed anything like that to go in the films. We watch so that nothing gets into the films that would be harmful in any way to any group or any country. We have large audiences of children and different groups, and we try to keep them as free from anything that would offend anybody as possible. We work hard to see that nothing of that sort creeps in.

Mr. SMITH. Do you have any people in your studio at the present time that you believe are Communist or Fascist, employed there?

Mr. DISNEY. No; at the present time I feel that everybody in my studio is 100 percent American.

Mr. SMITH. Have you had at any time, in your opinion, in the past, have you at any time in the past had any Communists employed at your studio?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes; in the past I had some people that I definitely feel were Communists.

Mr. SMITH. As a matter of fact, Mr. Disney, you experienced a strike at your studio, did you not?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. And is it your opinion that that strike was instituted by members of the Communist Party to serve their purposes?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, it proved itself so with time, and I definitely feel it was a Communist group trying to take over my artists and they did take them over.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you say they did take them over?

Mr. DISNEY. They did take them over.

Mr. SMITH. Will you explain that to the committee, please?

Mr. DISNEY. It came to my attention when a delegation of my boys, my artists, came to me and told me that Mr. Herbert Sorrell—

Mr. SMITH. Is that Herbert K. Sorrell?

Mr. DISNEY. Herbert K. Sorrell, was trying to take them over. I explained to them that it was none of my concern, that I had been cautioned to not even talk with any of my boys on labor. They said it was not a matter of labor, it was just a matter of them not wanting to go with Sorrell, and they had heard that I was going to sign with

Sorrell, and they said that they wanted an election to prove that Sorrell didn't have the majority, and I said that I had a right to demand an election. So when Sorrell came I demanded an election.

Sorrell wanted me to sign on a bunch of cards that he had there that he claimed were the majority, but the other side had claimed the same thing. I told Mr. Sorrell that there is only one way for me to go and that was an election and that is what the law had set up, the National Labor Relations Board was for that purpose. He laughed at me and he said that he would use the Labor Board as it suited his purposes and that he had been sucker enough to go for that Labor Board ballot and he had lost some election—I can't remember the name of the place—by one vote. He said it took him 2 years to get it back. He said he would strike, that that was his weapon. He said, "I have all of the tools of the trade sharpened," that I couldn't stand the ridicule or the smear of a strike. I told him that it was a matter of principle with me, that I couldn't go on working with my boys feeling that I had sold them down the river to him on his say-so, and he laughed at me and told me I was naive and foolish. He said, you can't stand this strike, I will smear you, and I will make a dust bowl out of your plant.

The CHAIRMAN. What was that?

Mr. DISNEY. He said he would make a dust bowl out of my plant if he chose to. I told him I would have to go that way, sorry, that he might be able to do all that, but I would have to stand on that. The result was that he struck.

I believed at that time that Mr. Sorrell was a Communist because of all the things that I had heard and having seen his name appearing on a number of Commie front things. When he pulled the strike the first people to smear me and put me on the unfair list were all of the Commie front organizations. I can't remember them all, they change so often, but one that is clear in my mind is the League of Women Voters,⁴⁵ the Peoples World, the Daily Worker, and the PM Magazine in New York. They smeared me. Nobody came near to find out what the true facts of the thing were. And I even went through the same smear in South America, through some Commie periodicals in South America, and generally throughout the world all of the Commie groups began smear campaigns against me and my pictures.

Mr. McDOWELL. In what fashion was that smear, Mr. Disney, what type of smear?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, they distorted everything, they lied: there was no way you could ever counteract anything that they did: they formed picket lines in front of the theaters, and, well, they called my plant a sweat-shop, and that is not true, and anybody in Hollywood would prove it otherwise. They claimed things there were not true at all and there was no way you could fight it back. It was not a labor problem at all because—I mean, I have never had labor trouble, and I think that would be backed up by anybody in Hollywood.

Mr. SMITH. As a matter of fact, you have how many unions operating in your plant?

The CHAIRMAN. Excuse me just a minute. I would like to ask a question.

Mr. SMITH. Pardon me.

⁴⁵ See appendix, pp. 534-538, for exhibit 58, being letter from Walter F. Disney to the Committee on Un-American Activities correcting this to read "League of Women Shoppers."

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, Mr. Disney, Communists out there smeared you because you wouldn't knuckle under?

Mr. DISNEY. I wouldn't go along with their way of operating. I insisted on it going through the National Labor Relations Board. And he told me outright that he used them as it suited his purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Supposing you had given in to him, then what would have been the outcome?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I would never have given in to him, because it was a matter of principle with me, and I fight for principles. My boys have been there, have grown up in the business with me, and I didn't feel like I could sign them over to anybody. They were vulnerable at that time. They were not organized. It is a new industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. How many labor unions, approximately, do you have operating in your studios at the present time?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, we operate with around 35—I think we have contacts with 30.

Mr. SMITH. At the time of this strike you didn't have any grievances or labor troubles whatsoever in your plant?

Mr. DISNEY. No. The only real grievance was between Sorrell and the boys within my plant, they demanding an election, and they never got it.

Mr. SMITH. Do you recall having had any conversations with Mr. Sorrell relative to communism?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, I do.

Mr. SMITH. Will you relate that conversation?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I didn't pull my punches on how I felt. He evidently heard that I had called them all a bunch of Communists—and I believe they are. At the meeting he leaned over and he said, "You think I am a Communist, don't you," and I told him that all I knew was what I heard and what I had seen, and he laughed and said, "Well, I used their money to finance my strike of 1937," and he said that he had gotten the money through the personal check of some actor, but he didn't name the actor. I didn't go into it any further. I just listened.

Mr. SMITH. Can you name any other individuals that were active at the time of the strike that you believe in your opinion are Communists?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I feel that there is one artist in my plant, that came in there, he came in about 1938, and he sort of stayed in the background, he wasn't too active, but he was the real brains of this, and I believe he is a Communist. His name is David Hilberman.

Mr. SMITH. How is it spelled?

Mr. DISNEY. H-i-l-b-e-r-m-a-n, I believe. I looked into his record and I found that, No. 1, that he had no religion and, No. 2, that he had spent considerable time at the Moscow Art Theater studying art direction, or something.

Mr. SMITH. Any others, Mr. Disney?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I think Sorrell is sure tied up with them. If he isn't a Communist he sure should be one.

Mr. SMITH. Do you remember the name of William Pomerance, did he have anything to do with it?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, sir. He came in later. Sorrell put him in charge as business manager of cartoonists and later he went to the Screen

Actors as their business agent and in turn he put in another man by the name of Maurice Howard, the present business agent. And they are all tied up with the same outfit.

Mr. SMITH. What is your opinion of Mr. Pomerance and Mr. Howard as to whether or not they are or are not Communists?

Mr. DISNEY. In my opinion they are Communists. No one has any way of proving those things.⁴⁶

Mr. SMITH. Were you able to produce during the strike?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, I did, because there was a very few, very small majority that was on the outside, and all the other unions ignored all the lines because of the set-up of the thing.

Mr. SMITH. What is your personal opinion of the Communist Party, Mr. Disney, as to whether or not it is a political party?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I don't believe it is a political party. I believe it is an un-American thing. The thing that I resent the most is that they are able to get into these unions, take them over, and represent to the world that a group of people that are in my plant, that I know are good, 100-percent Americans, are trapped by this group, and they are represented to the world as supporting all of those ideologies, and it is not so, and I feel that they really ought to be smoked out and shown up for what they are, so that all of the good, free causes in this country, all the liberalisms that really are American, can go out without the taint of communism. That is my sincere feeling on it.

Mr. SMITH. Do you feel that there is a threat of communism in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes, there is, and there are many reasons why they would like to take it over or get in and control it, or disrupt it, but I don't think they have gotten very far, and I think the industry is made up of good Americans, just like in my plant, good, solid Americans.

My boys have been fighting it longer than I have. They are trying to get out from under it and they will in time if we can just show them up.

Mr. SMITH. There are presently pending before this committee two bills relative to outlawing the Communist Party. What thoughts have you as to whether or not those bills should be passed?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I don't know as I qualify to speak on that. I feel if the thing can be proven un-American that it ought to be outlawed. I think in some way it should be done without interfering with the rights of the people. I think that will be done. I have that faith. Without interfering, I mean, with the good, American rights that we all have now, and we want to preserve.

Mr. SMITH. Have you any suggestions to offer as to how the industry can be helped in fighting this menace?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, I think there is a good start toward it. I know that I have been handicapped out there in fighting it, because they have been hiding behind this labor set-up, they get themselves closely tied up in the labor thing, so that if you try to get rid of them they make a labor case out of it. We must keep the American labor unions clean. We have got to fight for them.

⁴⁶ See appendix, p. 538, for exhibit 59, being letter from Walter E. Disney to the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated November 3, 1947.

Mr. SMITH. That is all of the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

Mr. DISNEY. Sir?

Mr. McDOWELL. I have no questions. You have been a good witness.

Mr. DISNEY. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Disney, you are the fourth producer we have had as a witness, and each one of those four producers said, generally speaking, the same thing, and that is that the Communists have made inroads, have attempted inroads. I just want to point that out because there seems to be a very strong unanimity among the producers that have testified before us. In addition to producers, we have had actors and writers testify to the same. There is no doubt but what the movies are probably the greatest medium for entertainment in the United States and in the world. I think you, as a creator of entertainment, probably are one of the greatest examples in the profession. I want to congratulate you on the form of entertainment which you have given the American people and given the world and congratulate you for taking time out to come here and testify before this committee. He has been very helpful.

Do you have any more questions, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. SMITH. I am sure he does not have any more, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STRIPLING. No; I have no more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Disney.

The Chair would like to announce that the witnesses on Monday will be Mr. Eric Johnston, Mr. Roy Brewer, John Howard Lawson, Dalton Trumbo, Mr. Alvah Bessie, and Mr. Emmett Lavery.

We stand adjourned until Monday.

(Whereupon, at 2:30 p. m., an adjournment was taken until 10:30 a. m., Monday, October 27, 1947.)

HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

MONDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman), presiding.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Messrs. Louis J. Russell, H. A. Smith, and Robert B. Craston, investigators; and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. Everyone please take their seats.

The record will show that a subcommittee is present, consisting of Mr. Vail, Mr. McDowell, and Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. The first witness, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. John Howard Lawson.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lawson.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Chairman, if you will recall, at the outset of this hearing Mr. Crum and I made a motion to quash the subpoenas addressed to Mr. Lawson and some 18 other witnesses whom we represent. You indicated at that time that this would be the appropriate occasion at which to present our arguments for the quashing of the subpoenas, on the ground that this committee is illegal and unconstitutional, both in the manner in which the authority given to it by the Congress has been executed, and by the terms of that authority itself.

Can we proceed at this time with that motion? Also, Mr. Crum has a motion relating to the recalling of certain witnesses, with an opportunity to examine them.

I would like to present the motion to quash first, Mr. Chairman, if you please.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kenny, didn't you give us a brief in connection with that motion?

Mr. KENNY. There has been a brief submitted. However, I would like the opportunity to argue it orally, to point out to the committee that it has no legal or constitutional power to proceed and that therefore—

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KENNY (continuing). These motions should be quashed.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

Mr. Kenny, do you have any additional information that was not in the brief?

Mr. KENNY. I think we have additional information based on the conduct of the——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, do you have it?

Mr. KENNY. Oh, yes.

Mr. CRUM. We have it here.

The CHAIRMAN. I am listening to Mr. Kenny.

Mr. KENNY. We do, based on the conduct of this committee last week. We think two additional evidences of the illegality of this committee came out:

1. In attempts by members of the committee to dictate to various producers the content of films that are to be produced; and

2. An effort indicated by questioning to induce the motion-picture producers to create a blacklist, to hire men not on the basis of ability, but on the basis of political beliefs.

Now, both of these, we say, indicate an unconstitutional purpose, a purpose to invade the domain protected by the first amendment, which is the provision that Congress shall pass no law invading the freedom of speech or of conscience. And as to——

The CHAIRMAN. Those two points, then, constitutes your additional information?

Mr. KENNY. Those two, plus, of course—we have a statement on that which we could file.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

Mr. Kenny, aside from any statement that you may have, your additional points are the two that you mentioned, that is, dictation and the creation of a blacklist; that is correct, is it?

Mr. KENNY. Those are the points.

We said at the outset that this committee was illegal and unconstitutional——

The CHAIRMAN. I know. All right, Mr. Stripling, you may be heard.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the point which Mr. Kenny has set forth—if he has a remedy it is in the courts of the land and not before a committee of Congress. A committee of Congress can no more set aside a law than it can do any other thing. Therefore, Mr. Kenny should go into court, if he seeks any remedy on the points which he has submitted to the committee. I see no point for the committee to interrupt its proceedings to permit Mr. Kenny to stand up and make a lot of points which he knows are out of order before this tribunal.

Mr. KENNY. Just one brief response to that, and that is: The committee is the servant of the Constitution, just as much as the citizen is, and certainly Congress should be given the opportunity, or any committee of Congress, to consider whether or not it is proceeding constitutionally.

It is quite true, as Mr. Stripling says, that the courts are open, but I believe that the first opportunity should be given the person who first is accused of proceeding illegally.

Now, the committee has this opportunity at this time to consider the basic constitutional principles under which it is proceeding, and I think it would be the first time that this committee ever has done that. I think, if we are given that opportunity, the committee might well

rule with us, if they can hear our arguments out and give them full consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Kenny, we have read your brief very carefully. In view of the additional points, however, which you bring up, why, the committee will now take under consideration the whole question, not only based on your original brief, but also these additional points.

The committee will go into executive session until we have concluded.

Mr. CRUM. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that you consider our motion to cross-examine——

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will be in recess. The committee will leave the room and go into executive session.

Mr. CRUM. May we hand these to you, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; glad to have them.

Mr. CRUM. Thank you.

(The committee went into executive session.)

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Mr. Kenny, this is the unanimous decision of this subcommittee. It is the decision on the brief which you submitted, plus the two additional points.

Mr. KENNY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. No committee of Congress has the right to establish its own legality or constitutionality. A committee of Congress cannot disqualify itself from the provisions of the law. We operate under Public Law 601. We cannot set aside this law to suit the convenience of certain witnesses or their counsel. As a former attorney general of the State of California you certainly know that your remedy, if any, is in the courts.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness.

Mr. CRUM. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. John Howard Lawson.

Mr. CRUM. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. I am sorry——

Mr. CRUM. May I request the right of cross-examination?

I ask you to bring back and permit us to cross-examine the witnesses, Adolph Menjou, Fred Niblo, John Charles Moffitt, Richard Macauley, Rupert Hughes, Sam Wood, Ayn Rand, James McGuinness——

The CHAIRMAN. The request——

Mr. CRUM. Howard Rushmore——

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. CRUM. Morrie Ryskind, Oliver Carlson——

The CHAIRMAN. The request is denied.

Mr. CRUM. In order to show that these witnesses lied.

The CHAIRMAN. That request is denied.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. John Howard Lawson.

(John Howard Lawson, accompanied by Robert W. Kenny and Bartley Crum take places at witness table.)

The CHAIRMAN. Stand and please raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LAWSON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF JOHN HOWARD LAWSON

Mr. LAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here which I wish to make——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, all right; let me see your statement.

(Statement handed to the chairman.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have a copy of that?

Mr. CRUM. We can get you copies.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't care to read any more of the statement. The statement will not be read. I read the first line.

Mr. LAWSON. You have spent 1 week vilifying me before the American public——

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute——

Mr. LAWSON. And you refuse to allow me to make a statement on my rights as an American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. I refuse you to make the statement, because of the first sentence in your statement. That statement is not pertinent to the inquiry.

Now, this is a congressional committee—a congressional committee set up by law. We must have orderly procedure, and we are going to have orderly procedure.

Mr. Stripling, identify the witness.

Mr. LAWSON. The rights of American citizens are important in this room here, and I intend to stand up for those rights, Congressman Thomas.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson, will you state your full name, please?

Mr. LAWSON. I wish to protest against the unwillingness of this committee to read a statement, when you permitted Mr. Warner, Mr. Mayer, and others to read statements in this room.

My name is John Howard Lawson.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present address?

Mr. LAWSON. 9354 Burnett Avenue, San Fernando, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. LAWSON. New York City.

Mr. STRIPLING. What year?

Mr. LAWSON. 1894.

Mr. STRIPLING. Give us the exact date.

Mr. LAWSON. September 25.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson, you are here in response to a subpoena which was served upon you on September 19, 1947; is that true?

Mr. LAWSON. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. That subpoena called for your appearance before the committee on October 23, at 10:30 a. m.; is that correct?⁴⁷

Mr. LAWSON. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you receive the following telegram on October 11, addressed to you, Mr. John Howard Lawson, 9354 Burnett Avenue, San Fernando, Calif.?

Mr. LAWSON. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. I haven't read the telegram yet.

In response to the subpoena served upon you summoning you to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, in Washington, D. C., on October 23, you are hereby directed to appear on October 27 instead of October 23, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., room 226, Old House Office Building.

⁴⁷ See appendix, p. 539, for exhibit 60.

Signed: "J. Parnell Thomas, chairman."

Did you receive that telegram?

Mr. LAWSON. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are here before the committee in response to this subpoena and in response to this summons in the form of a telegram from the chairman?

Mr. LAWSON. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation, Mr. Lawson?

Mr. LAWSON. I am a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a writer?

Mr. LAWSON. All my life—at least 35 years—my adult life.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LAWSON. The raising of any question here in regard to membership, political beliefs, or affiliation—

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LAWSON. Is absolutely beyond the powers of this committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LAWSON. But—

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. It is a matter of public record that I am a member of the Screen Writers Guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. I ask—

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. I want to caution the people in the audience: You are the guests of this committee and you will have to maintain order at all times. I do not care for any applause or any demonstrations of one kind or another.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am also going to request that you instruct the witness to be responsive to the questions.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the witness will be more responsive to the questions.

Mr. LAWSON. Mr. Chairman, you permitted—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Never mind—

Mr. LAWSON (continuing). Witnesses in this room to make answers of three or four or five hundred words to questions here.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lawson, you will please be responsive to these questions and not continue to try to disrupt these hearings.

Mr. LAWSON. I am not on trial here, Mr. Chairman. This committee is on trial here before the American people. Let us get that straight.

The CHAIRMAN. We don't want you to be on trial.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson, how long have you been a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LAWSON. Since it was founded in its present form, in 1933.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever held any office in the guild?

Mr. LAWSON. The question of whether I have held office is also a question which is beyond the purview of this committee.

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. It is an invasion of the right of association under the Bill of Rights of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Please be responsive to the question.

Mr. LAWSON. It is also a matter—

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. Of public record—

The CHAIRMAN. You asked to be heard. Through your attorney, you asked to be heard, and we want you to be heard. And if you don't care to be heard, then we will excuse you and we will put the record in without your answers.

Mr. LAWSON. I wish to frame my own answers to your questions, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. And you will be responsive to the questions or you will be excused from the witness stand.

Mr. LAWSON. I will frame my own answers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. I repeat the question, Mr. Lawson:

Have you ever held any position in the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LAWSON. I stated that it is outside the purview of the rights of this committee to inquire into any form of association—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will determine what is in the purview of this committee.

Mr. LAWSON. My rights as an American citizen are no less than the responsibilities of this committee of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you are just making a big scene for yourself and getting all "het up". [Laughter.]

Be responsive to the questioning, just the same as all the witnesses have. You are no different from the rest.

Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. LAWSON. I am being treated differently from the rest.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not being treated differently.

Mr. LAWSON. Other witnesses have made statements, which included quotations from books, references to material which had no connection whatsoever with the interest of this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. We will determine whether it has connection.

Now, you go ahead—

Mr. LAWSON. It is absolutely beyond the power of this committee to inquire into my association in any organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lawson, you will have to stop or you will leave the witness stand. And you will leave the witness stand because you are in contempt. That is why you will leave the witness stand. And if you are just trying to force me to put you in contempt, you won't have to try much harder. You know what has happened to a lot of people that have been in contempt of this committee this year, don't you?

Mr. LAWSON. I am glad you have made it perfectly clear that you are going to threaten and intimidate the witnesses, Mr. Chairman.

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. I am an American and I am not at all easy to intimidate, and don't think I am.

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson, I repeat the question. Have you ever held any position in the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LAWSON. I have stated that the question is illegal. But it is a matter of public record that I have held many offices in the Screen Writers Guild. I was its first president, in 1933, and I have held office on the board of directors of the Screen Writers Guild at other times.

MR. STRIPLING. You have been employed in the motion-picture industry; have you not?

MR. LAWSON. I have.

MR. STRIPLING. Would you state some of the studios where you have been employed?

MR. LAWSON. Practically all of the studios, all the major studios.

MR. STRIPLING. As a screen writer?

MR. LAWSON. That is correct.

MR. STRIPLING. Would you list some of the pictures which you have written the script for?

MR. LAWSON. I must state again that you are now inquiring into the freedom of press and communications, over which you have no control whatsoever. You don't have to bring me here 3,000 miles to find out what pictures I have written. The pictures that I have written are very well known. They are such pictures as *Action in the North Atlantic*, *Sahara*—

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson—

MR. LAWSON. Such pictures as *Blockade*, of which I am very proud and in which I introduced the danger that this democracy faced from the attempt to destroy democracy in Spain in 1937. These matters are all matters of public record.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson, would you object if I read a list of the pictures, and then you can either state whether or not you did write the scripts?

MR. LAWSON. I have no objection at all.

MR. STRIPLING. Did you write *Dynamite*, by M-G-M?

MR. LAWSON. I preface my answer, again, by saying that it is outside the province of this committee, but it is well known that I did.

MR. STRIPLING. The *Sea Bat*, by M-G-M?

MR. LAWSON. It is well known that I did.

MR. STRIPLING. *Success at Any Price*, RKO?

MR. LAWSON. Yes; that is from a play of mine, *Success Story*.

MR. STRIPLING. *Party Wire*, Columbia?

MR. LAWSON. Yes; I did.

MR. STRIPLING. *Blockade*, United Artists, Wanger?

MR. LAWSON. That is correct.

MR. STRIPLING. *Algiers*, United Artists, Wanger?

MR. LAWSON. Correct.

MR. STRIPLING. *Earth Bound*, Twentieth Century Fox.

MR. LAWSON. Correct.

MR. STRIPLING. *Counterattack*, Columbia.

MR. LAWSON. Correct.

MR. STRIPLING. You have probably written others; have you not, Mr. Lawson?

MR. LAWSON. Many others. You have missed a lot of them.

MR. STRIPLING. You don't care to furnish them to the committee, do you?

MR. LAWSON. Not in the least interested.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Lawson, are you now, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party of the United States?

MR. LAWSON. In framing my answer to that question I must emphasize the points that I have raised before. The question of communism is in no way related to this inquiry, which is an attempt to get

control of the screen and to invade the basic rights of American citizens in all fields.

Mr. McDOWELL. Now, I must object——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman——

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. The question here relates not only to the question of my membership in any political organization, but this committee is attempting to establish the right——

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON (continuing). Which has been historically denied to any committee of this sort, to invade the rights and privileges and immunity of American citizens, whether they be Protestant, Methodist, Jewish, or Catholic, whether they be Republicans or Democrats or anything else.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Mr. Lawson, just quiet down again.

Mr. Lawson, the most pertinent question that we can ask is whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party. Now, do you care to answer that question?

Mr. LAWSON. You are using the old technique, which was used in Hitler Germany in order to create a scare here——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Oh——

Mr. LAWSON. In order to create an entirely false atmosphere in which this hearing is conducted——

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. In order that you can then smear the motion-picture industry, and you can proceed to the press, to any form of communication in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. You have learned——

Mr. LAWSON. The Bill of Rights was established precisely to prevent the operation of any committee which could invade the basic rights of Americans.

Now, if you want to know——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the witness is not answering the question.

Mr. LAWSON. If you want to know——

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. LAWSON. About the perjury that has been committed here and the perjury that is planned.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lawson——

Mr. LAWSON. You permit me and my attorneys to bring in here the witnesses that testified last week and you permit us to cross-examine these witnesses, and we will show up the whole tissue of lie——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). We are going to get the answer to that question if we have to stay here for a week.

Are you a member of the Communist Party, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWSON. It is unfortunate and tragic that I have to teach this committee the basic principles of American——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). That is not the question. That is not the question. The question is: Have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAWSON. I am framing my answer in the only way in which any American citizen can frame his answer to a question which absolutely invades his rights.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you refuse to answer that question; is that correct?

Mr. LAWSON. I have told you that I will offer my beliefs, affiliations, and everything else to the American public, and they will know where I stand.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Excuse the witness—

Mr. LAWSON. As they do from what I have written.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Stand away from the stand—

Mr. LAWSON. I have written Americanism for many years, and I shall continue to fight for the Bill of Rights, which you are trying to destroy.

The CHAIRMAN. Officers, take this man away from the stand—

[Applause and boos.]

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). There will be no demonstrations. No demonstrations, for or against. Everyone will please be seated.

All right, go ahead, Mr. Stripling. Proceed.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the committee has made exhaustive investigation and research into the Communist affiliations of Mr. John Howard Lawson. Numerous witnesses under oath have identified Mr. Lawson as a member of the Communist Party.

I have here a nine-page memorandum which details at length his affiliations with the Communist Party and its various front organizations.

I now ask that Mr. Louis J. Russell, an investigator for the committee, take the stand.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell, raise your right hand, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

Mr. STRIPLING. In order to give the committee the type of affiliations that Mr. Lawson has had with the Communist Party, I should like to refer, Mr. Chairman, to an article which appeared in the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party. This article is dated September 6, 1935, and appears on page 5 of the Daily Worker.⁴⁸ Under the headline "Artists, writers," it says:

We cannot let the Daily go under—

referring to the Daily Worker. It says:

Need for Daily Worker has grown a thousand times since 1934.

By John Howard Lawson. The article bears a picture of Mr. Lawson, and it appears on the front page of the Daily Worker.

Under the Daily Worker heading, the following language appears:

The Daily Worker—central organ of the Communist Party of the United States, section of the Communist International.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, another article from the Daily Worker by John Howard Lawson, dated February 26, 1935, page 5:⁴⁹

The Story of William Z. Foster, a tribute on the occasion of his fifty-fourth birthday, by John Howard Lawson.

⁴⁸ See appendix, p. 539, for exhibit 61.

⁴⁹ See appendix, p. 539, for exhibit 62.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, over 100 exhibits showing Mr. Lawson's affiliations with the party.

I see no point in taking the committee's time in reading each exhibit. If the Chair desires, I will read the nine-page memorandum, after Mr. Russell has testified. I will submit copies of this——

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, they will be made a part of the record.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, you have been sworn in this hearing; have you not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Your name is Louis J. Russell?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are a member of the investigative staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were formerly with the FBI for 10 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you detailed to make an investigation as to the Communist Party affiliations of John Howard Lawson?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. What did your investigation disclose?

Mr. RUSSELL. During the course of my investigation and the investigation conducted by the committee, we were furnished—or I was—with copies of Communist Party registration cards pertaining to certain individuals for the year 1944.

The CHAIRMAN. Speak louder, please.

Mr. RUSSELL. One of those cards bears the number "47275" and is made out in the name of John Howard Lawson, 4542 Coldwater Canyon; city, Los Angeles; county, Los Angeles; State, California. There is a notation contained on this registration card: "New card issued on December 10, 1944." Other information contained on this card, which referred to the personal description of the John Howard Lawson mentioned, on Communist Party registration No. 47275—the description is as follows:

Male, white. Occupation, writer. Industry, motion pictures. Member of CIO-A. F. of L. "Independent union or no union," "Independent union" is checked. There is a question asked on this registration card: "Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker?" The answer, "Yes," is checked.⁵⁰

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the committee's pleasure with regard to the nine-page memorandum? Do you want it read into the record or do you want it made a part of the record?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee wants you to read it.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE COMMUNIST AFFILIATIONS OF JOHN HOWARD LAWSON

John Howard Lawson is a screen writer and one of the most active Communists in the Hollywood movie industry. He has written the following scripts:

⁵⁰ See appendix, p. 539, for exhibit 63.

Dynamite (M-G-M); The Sea Bat (M-G-M); Blushing Brides (M-G-M); Ship From Shanghai (M-G-M); Bachelor Apartment (Radio Films); Success at Any Price (RKO-Radio), 1934; Goodbye Love (RKO-Radio), 1934; Treasure Island (M-G-M), 1934; Party Wire (Columbia), 1935; Blockade (United Artists-Wanger), 1938; Algiers (United Artists-Wanger), 1938; They Shall Have Music (United Artists-Goldwyn), 1939; Four Sons (20th Century-Fox), 1940; Earthbound (20th Century-Fox), 1940; Sahara (Columbia), 1943; Counterattack (Columbia), 1945.

The files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities show that—

1. Rena M. Vale, a former member of the Communist Party and a screen writer, testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on July 22, 1940, that Mr. Lawson had been identified to her as a Communist Party member when she met him at a Communist Party fraction meeting. She further testified that Mr. Lawson during the meeting gave advice on inserting the Communist Party line into drama. The State legislative committee investigating un-American activities in California has cited Mr. Lawson as "one of the most important Marxist strategists in southern California," in its 1945 report, page 118. The California report notes on the same page that Rena M. Vale also testified before the State legislative committee and that the witness identified Lawson as a member of the Communist Party fraction of the Screen Writers Guild who had given advice on the Communist Party program in the writing of the play, *Sun Rises in the West*. The State legislative committee states further, in its 1947 report, page 260, that Mr. Lawson directed a Communist bloc of about 65 members in local 47, the Hollywood local of the American Federation of Musicians, AFL, between the years 1937 and 1940.

2. The Communist Party has been publicly defended by John Howard Lawson. The *Daily Worker*, in an article on April 16, 1947, page 2, and reprinted in the Sunday edition of April 20, 1947, page 8, announced that Mr. Lawson was one of the signers of a statement opposing any legislative attempts to restrict the activities of the Communist Party. The organization sponsoring the statement was the Civil Rights Congress, which the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report published September 2, 1947, declared to be "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party." The Civil Rights Congress is now defending such persons as Gerhart Eisler, an agent of the Communist International convicted of passport fraud, and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party general secretary, convicted of contempt of Congress. The Civil Rights Congress is the successor to the International Labor Defense, former legal arm of the Communist Party, according to former Attorney General Francis Biddle. John Howard Lawson also came to the support of the Communist Party on another occasion, according to the *Daily Worker* for March 18, 1945, page 2. Mr. Lawson was listed in this issue as one of the signers of a statement hailing a War Department order allowing military commissions for Communists. Sponsor of the statement was the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which was cited as a Communist front organization by former Attorney General Biddle. Biddle pointed out the organization's defense of such prominent Communist leaders as Sam Darcy and Robert Wood, party secretaries for Pennsylvania and Oklahoma, respectively. The organization was also cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

3. John Howard Lawson has given his support to a number of individual Communists. The *People's World*, official west coast Communist organ, reported on October 22, 1942, page 2, that Mr. Lawson was backing Mrs. LaRue McCormick, a candidate for the California State Senate on the Communist Party ticket. Mr. Lawson was one of the signers of a statement in defense of the Comintern agent Gerhart Eisler, according to the *Daily Worker* for February 28, 1947, page 2. The organization sponsoring this statement in behalf of Eisler was the Civil Rights Congress.

Mr. Chairman, would it be agreeable if Mr. Gaston read the remainder of this memorandum? It is single-spaced, nine pages, and if I have to question additional witnesses today it is going to be quite a burden on my voice. I ask that he be permitted to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Gaston; you may proceed with it.

Mr. GASTON (reading) :

Mr. Lawson was a sponsor of the Schappes Defense Committee, according to an undated letterhead of the organization. This committee worked for the release of Morris U. Schappes, an avowed Communist teacher convicted of perjury in New York City, and the organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. Mr. Lawson was also a signer of an open letter which the Schappes Defense Committee sent to New York Gov. Thomas Dewey in an effort to have Schappes pardoned. This fact was reported in the New York Sun, September 27, 1944. Mr. Lawson was a member and sponsor of the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges, according to an organization letterhead dated September 11, 1941. Bridges, who led the disastrous San Francisco general strike of 1934, was identified as a Communist Party member by the Daily Worker itself. The Daily Worker of February 13, 1937, page 2, announced Mr. Lawson as a signer of a cable sent to the Brazilian Chamber of Deputies on behalf of Luis Carlos Prestes, former member of the Communist International Executive Committee and a Brazilian Communist leader, and on behalf of Arthur Ewert, another Comintern representative and a former Communist deputy of the German Reichstag, both of whom were imprisoned by the Brazilian Government in connection with an attempted revolt. The cable was sent under the auspices of the Joint Committee for the Defense of Brazilian People, which was organized specifically for the defense of Communist Prestes and Ewert.

4. John Howard Lawson has long been affiliated with the Communist Party's official organ, the Daily Worker. On May 18, 1934, page 1, the Daily Worker headlined the arrest of its "correspondent" John Howard Lawson for "being present" at a trial of strike leaders in Birmingham, Ala., printed a long story by Lawson on the trial. Lawson's story eulogized one of the strike leaders, whom he identified as a Communist Party organizer. He reported that the organizer at one point in the trial told the court in ringing tones that "The Communist Party is actively participating in strike struggles and building a powerful trade-union movement * * * in order to establish a Soviet America as part of the world struggle of the toiling masses for communism." This article was the basis of a libel suit against Lawson, according to the Daily Worker which appeared later (June 7, 1934, p. 1). This later issue of the Daily Worker also claimed that the arrest of Lawson in Birmingham had been aimed at driving the Daily Worker from the South. The Daily Worker officially listed Mr. Lawson as one of its contributors in the issue of December 21, 1935, page 3. Mr. Lawson has contributed articles to the publication as recently as June 1, 1947, page 7. Mr. Lawson's support of the publication has also included appeals for financial aid. In the issue of September 6, 1935, he wrote that he wished "to add my voice to the appeal of the Daily Worker for a \$60,000 sustaining fund." The same article, appearing on page 5, refers to the Soviet Union as "the great toiler for peace."

5. Other Communist publications have also received support from John Howard Lawson. New Masses is an official Communist weekly magazine. Mr. Lawson has been listed as a contributing editor in New Masses issue for October 1927, page 3; December 15, 1936, page 35; January 5, 1937, page 23; February 18, 1941, page 30; January 27, 1942, page 24; and April 30, 1946, page 2. The People's World is an official west-coast Communist paper. According to the Daily Worker for April 15, 1946, page 11, Mr. Lawson served as chairman of a meeting held on April 9, 1946, in Los Angeles under the auspices of the People's World. The Worker reported that in his speech at the meeting, Mr. Lawson called for an end to fear of the word "Marx." A prowar press conference held in behalf of the People's World on August 4, 1943, in Los Angeles was endorsed by Mr. Lawson, according to the issue of the People's World for July 9, 1943. On June 24, 1944, the People's World reported that Mr. Lawson had praised the paper. Mainstream is a literary magazine which has been promoted by the Communist press and which advertises itself in the Daily Worker as a "Marxist literary quarterly" (Daily Worker, June 11, 1947, p. 4). Mr. Lawson is listed as a member of the editorial board of Mainstream, according to the issue of Political Affairs for November 1946. The 1947 winter issue of Mainstream carries an article by Mr. Lawson on page 23. On June 11, 1947, Mr. Lawson, together with Hanns Eisler, composer of The Comintern, addressed a meeting sponsored by Mainstream in New York City, according to a leaflet put out by the publication.

6. John Howard Lawson has been affiliated with numerous organizations whose principal purpose was the defense of Communists. He served as treasurer of both the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners and the

National Committee for People's Rights, according to letterheads of these organizations. Attorney General Francis Biddle (in the Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686) stated that the "National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners is substantially equivalent to International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party" and pointed out that the organization had defended such Communists as Earl Browder and Angelo Herndon. "In January 1938," the Attorney General went on to say, "its (National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners) name was changed to the National Committee for People's Rights." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners as a Communist front on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, and cited the National Committee for People's Rights as a Communist front on the same dates.

7. The International Labor Defense, in addition to being identified as the legal arm of the Communist Party by Attorney General Biddle, has been cited for its Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom, Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities and the California Committee on Un-American Activities. The official publication of the organization which defends Communists is called the Labor Defender. John Howard Lawson was a contributing editor to the Labor Defender, according to an issue of the publication for October 1936, page 3. John Howard Lawson also served as a sponsor of the Sleepy Lagoon Defense Committee, which was supported by the International Labor Defense, according to a letterhead of August 9, 1944. In addition, the California State Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities has noted that Mr. Lawson was a sponsor of the Citizens Committee for the Defense of Mexican-American Youth (1945 report, p. 195). The latter committee was the predecessor of the Sleepy Lagoon Defense Committee and was avowedly organized by La Rue McCormick, one-time Communist candidate for California State senator.

8. John Howard Lawson endorsed legislation sponsored by the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, according to the Daily Worker for April 11, 1938, page 5. The committee, which specializes in defending foreign-born Communists like Gerhart Eisler and Harry Bridges, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. Mr. Lawson was also a member of the American Committee for Anti-Nazi German Seamen, according to a committee letterhead dated January 8, 1939. The organization was engaged in defending German seamen active in distributing Communist literature in Germany. New Masses for December 6, 1938, page 20, reports that Mr. Lawson was one of the signers of a telegram sent to Peru pleading for the release of Communist political prisoners in that country.

9. John Howard Lawson has shown an active interest in the Soviet Union. The Daily Worker of April 28, 1938, page 4, shows that Mr. Lawson was a signer of a statement by the American Progressives Defending the Moscow Trials, which was the usual name affixed to a series of trials then being held in the Soviet Union for numerous opponents of dictator Stalin. It has been established that these trials had for their aim the purging of all political enemies of Josef Stalin and his political cohorts, although the Communist press portrayed the subjects of these trials as being counter-revolutionists and collaborators with Great Britain in an attempt to overthrow the Soviet regime by furnishing military information to alleged British espionage agents.

10. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. Mr. Lawson acted as a sponsor of a reception for Mikhail Kalatozov, Soviet film representative, which was held in Hollywood on August 22, 1943, under the auspices of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. According to the Daily Worker for July 5, 1943, page 4, Mr. Lawson also signed a statement defending the film, Mission to Moscow, which had been charged by a number of authorities on the Soviet Union with being distorted and unreliable. The statement was promoted by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

11. Soviet Russia Today was the official monthly publication of the Friends of Soviet Union, the predecessor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. The magazine was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. John Howard Lawson contributed to Soviet Russia Today, according to the issue of the publication for March 1935, page 9. The same publication of September

1939, page 25, listed Mr. Lawson as one of the signers of an Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union. The publication for November 1937, page 79, records the name of Mr. Lawson as one of the signers of a Golden Book of American Soviet Friendship.

12. The American Council on Soviet Relations has been cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle as a Communist front (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7688) and has received the same citation from the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on Mar 29, 1942. Prof. John Dewey's Special Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940 characterized the organization as under Communist control, influence, or in collaboration with the Communist Party. One of the signers of an open letter sent to the president of the American Council on Soviet Relations was John Howard Lawson, according to an official folder of the council.

13. Many Communist-front organizations which supported Soviet foreign policy were backed by John Howard Lawson. The American League Against War and Fascism was active in support of Soviet foreign policy against the democracies between 1932 and 1937. It has been cited by Attorney General Biddle as an organization seeking "to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities has cited this organization as subversive on January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944. The Daily Worker for June 27, 1934, page 1, reveals that Mr. Lawson was a speaker at a were backed by John Howard Lawson. The American League Against War and Fascism. Mr. Lawson was a sponsor of the New York City Conference Against War and Fascism, which was organized by the American League Against War and Fascism, according to the Daily Worker for January 11, 1937, page 2. Mr. Lawson has also contributed to Fight, the official publication of the American League Against War and Fascism, according to as issue of Fight for October 1934, page 3. The league was dedicated to an openly treasonable program.

14. When the Communist line changed in favor of a united front of the democracies against the Fascist aggressors, the Communists in America formed a successor to the American League Against War and Fascism in 1937, known as the American League for Peace and Democracy. The theatrical subsidiary of the American League for Peace and Democracy was the Theatre Arts Committee, which was cited as a Communist front by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. The Theatre Arts Committee was also affiliated with the League of Workers Theatres, a section of the International Union of the Revolutionary Theatre with headquarters in Moscow. John Howard Lawson was a member of the advisory council of the Theatre Arts Committee, according to an undated letterhead of the organization.

15. After the Stalin-Hitler Pact was signed in 1939, the Communists established the American Peace Mobilization, which opposed lend-lease, aid to Britain, the defense program, and picketed the White House. It also supported a number of strikes in defense industries. The organization has been cited as a Communist front by the Attorney General Francis Biddle, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, and the California Committee on Un-American Activities. An official program listed John Howard Lawson as a sponsor of a meeting held by the American Peace Mobilization in New York City on April 5 and 6, 1941.

16. Among the new Communist fronts that sprang up when the Soviet Union and the United States were allies in a war against fascism was the Artists' Front to Win the War, which made its debut at a mass meeting at Carnegie Hall in New York City on October 16, 1942. The organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The official program for the mass meeting at Carnegie Hall listed John Howard Lawson as one of the sponsors. Thus, Mr. Lawson has publicly avowed his allegiance to the line of the Communist Party during four distinctly divergent periods.

17. At the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, held in Moscow in 1935, George Dimitroff, general secretary, called upon all affiliated Communist parties to make the greatest efforts in behalf of the campaign of the Spanish Communists during Spain's civil war. A number of projects were organized by American Communists in response to this request. Among them were the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, cited as subversive by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on April 21, 1943, and March 29, 1944, and the American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy, cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. John Howard Lawson served as

secretary and as a member of the board of directors of the American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy, according to the issues of *New Masses* for February 16, 1937, page 28, January 19, 1937, page 25, January 26, 1937, page 32, and an organizational letterhead dated February 19, 1937. Mr. Lawson was one of the patrons of a benefit performance and dance sponsored by the Manhattan chapter of the Medical Bureau to Aid Spanish Democracy, according to an undated announcement of the dance, held May 22, 1937. On a letterhead dated April 29, 1939, the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy announced that Mr. Lawson was a member of its theater-arts committee.

18. The American Committee to Save Refugees was part of the Communist campaign for Spanish Communists and was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The organization provided transportation and support for international Communist agents such as Gerhart Eisler. John Howard Lawson was the signer of a statement sponsored by the American Committee to Save Refugees, according to an undated leaflet of the organization entitled "For the Rescue of Refugees."

19. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee likewise is engaged in providing transportation and support for international Communist agents like Gerhart Eisler. It was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. It was cited for contempt of Congress on April 16, 1946, and its leaders were convicted in a Federal court on June 27, 1947. John Howard Lawson was one of the sponsors of a dinner held by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee in New York on October 27, 1943, according to a dinner program.

20. The League of American Writers was an affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow, and the league was pledged to the defense of the Soviet Union and the use of "art as an instrument of the class struggle." This organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Francis Biddle said that "The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686). The league was founded at a Congress of American Revolutionary Writers held April 26 through 28, 1935 in New York City. The *Daily Worker* for January 18, 1935, page 5, reveals that John Howard Lawson was one of the signers of the call for this Congress of American Revolutionary Writers. The *Daily Worker* for April 29, 1935, pages 1 and 2, further revealed that Mr. Lawson presented a reading of *Technique in the Drama* at this writers' congress. Mr. Lawson was listed as a member of the executive committee of the League of American Writers in the *Daily Worker* for April 30, 1935, and as vice president of the League of American Writers in *New Masses* for June 17, 1941, page 10, and the *Daily Worker* for September 14, 1942, page 7. A statement sponsored by the league in behalf of a second front was signed by Mr. Lawson according to the *Daily Worker* for September 14, 1942, page 7. A statement signed by John Howard Lawson appears on page 67 of a league pamphlet entitled "We Hold These Truths." Mr. Lawson was a signer of the call to the second biennial meeting of the League of American Writers, according to *New Masses* for May 4, 1937, page 25. Mr. Lawson signed the call for the third congress, also, according to the magazine, *Direction*, for May-June 1939, page 1. Mr. Lawson signed the call for and also attended the fourth congress of the league which was held in New York June 6 through June 8, 1941, according to *New Masses* for June 17, 1941, pages 9-10, and for April 22, 1941, page 25.

21. The League of American Writers operated a writers' school at 1717 North Vine Street in Hollywood. The *People's World* for February 11, 1943, page 5, listed Mr. Lawson as a lecturer at the writers' school.

22. At this same time, the Communists were operating a Los Angeles workers' school. Eva Shafran, a Communist organizer, was the director, and La Rue McCormick, who was a candidate for California State senator on the Communist Party ticket, served on the board of directors. According to official literature of the school, John Howard Lawson taught at the Los Angeles workers' school in 1943, 1944, and 1945.

23. The People's Educational Center in Los Angeles also was Communist-directed. It was started in the fall of 1943 with a loan of \$1,000 from the writers' school of the League of American Writers and it received a rather complete Communist library from the Los Angeles workers' school. The People's Educa-

tional Center has been cited as a Communist-front organization by the joint fact-finding committee on un-American activities of the California Legislature and records show that numerous members of the faculty and staff of the People's Educational Center were card-holding members of the Communist Party, among them Carl Winters, Eva Shafran, Mildren Raskin, and Bruce Minton. A booklet announcing the curriculum of the center for the winter of 1947 lists John Howard Lawson as a member of the board of directors of the People's Educational Center. Also leaflet America's 10th Man lists John Howard Lawson as a lecturer for a series starting September 26, 1944.

24. The Hollywood Writers Mobilization was the name given to the Hollywood League of American Writers after the League of American Writers could no longer conceal its Communist domination. The original pledge of the League of American Writers to defend the Soviet Union and to use "art as an instrument of the class struggle" is now the basis upon which the policies of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization are founded. John Howard Lawson is a member of the editorial board of the Hollywood Quarterly, a publication sponsored by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, according to the 1947 report of the California State legislative committee investigating un-American activities (p. 107). The Hollywood Citizen News for January 13, 1947, lists John Howard Lawson as the proposer of a plan adopted by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization to set up a committee to investigate any investigators of Communist influence in the movie industry.

Mr. McDOWELL. Wait a minute. Read that again. I didn't get that last statement.

Mr. GASTON (reading):

The Hollywood Citizen News for January 13, 1947, lists John Howard Lawson as the proposer of a plan adopted by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization to set up a committee to investigate any investigators of Communist influence in the movie industry. Mr. Lawson presented the plan at a meeting of the mobilization on January 12, 1947, in the El Patio Theater in Hollywood, the newspaper reported. Mr. Lawson also served on the general committee in charge of a writers' congress held by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization at the University of California at Los Angeles October 1 through 3, 1943, according to an official program of the congress.

25. Book Union, Inc., is a Communist book-of-the-month club, which was launched at the initiative of International Publishers, a Communist publishing house. The Book Union was closely associated with the League of American Writers and was cited for Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. John Howard Lawson is listed as a member of the advisory council of the Book Union in an undated letterhead of the organization. The letter offered members the book, Soviet Communism: A New Civilization?

26. The American Youth for Democracy is the official successor of the Young Communist League. It has been the subject of a report by the House Committee on Un-American Activities which described its character in detail. Its "sinister purposes" have been denounced by the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Congressional Record, Mar. 24, 1947, p. A1298). John Howard Lawson is listed as a national sponsor of the American Youth for Democracy in the organization's publication, the Spotlight, for April 1944, page 19.

27. The New Theatre was the official monthly magazine of the League of Workers Theatres, a section of the International Union of Revolutionary Theatre, with headquarters in Moscow. The league was used to present Communist propaganda plays and to raise funds for Communist purposes. The magazine was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. John Howard Lawson contributed to the New Theatre of June 1935, page 10, and he is listed as a contributing editor in the issues for February 1934, page 3, and November 1934, page 11.

28. The New Theatre League was a successor of the League of Workers Theatres. It was formed in January 1935 and was cited for its Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. It also presented Communist propaganda plays and raised funds for Communist purposes. The New Theatre League published the Theatre Workshop on which John Howard Lawson served as a contributing editor, according to an issue of

the publication for January 1937. The Daily Worker for April 23, 1936, page 5, reported that Mr. Lawson sent greetings to the biennial national conference of the New Theatre League in Philadelphia.

29. The Theatre Union was one of the affiliates of the League of Workers Theatres, which in turn was tied to the Moscow-directed International Union of the Revolutionary Theatre. Theatre Union reflected the current line of the Communist Party in its propaganda and was used to raise funds for Communist purposes. It produced plays by such writers for New Masses as George Sklar and Albert Maltz. A leaflet of the Theatre Union announced that John Howard Lawson was a member of its advisory board.

30. Frontier Films were producers and distributors of pro-Communist films, including a film on the Communist-led strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee. The organization was headed by the following contributors to the Communist press: Albert Maltz, Kyle Crichton, Irving Lerner, Clifford Odets, Edwin Rolfe, and George Seldes. It was cited for a Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by Professor John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. The Daily Worker for April 6, 1937, page 9, shows that John Howard Lawson was a member of the staff of Frontier Films.

31. The Hollywood Democratic Committee was the successor of the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, which was organized by Isaac Romaine, alias V. J. Jerome, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party. An official ballot of July 26, 1944, lists John Howard Lawson as a candidate for the executive board of the Hollywood Democratic Committee. The People's World for August 3, 1943, reported that Mr. Lawson enunciated a program of action for the Hollywood Democratic Committee at a meeting of the committee in 1943.

32. The Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions has been charged with being Communist-dominated by Harold Ickes and other liberals, who previously had supported it. It was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on September 2, 1947. John Howard Lawson was a member of the board of directors of the Hollywood branch, according to the 1947 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, page 297.

33. The Progressive Citizens of America was founded as a frankly pro-Communist group as a result of the split in the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions after Harold Ickes and other liberals had condemned the Independent Citizens Committee as Communist-dominated. The Progressive Citizens of America was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in a report of June 12, 1947. An official ballot of February 11, 1947, listed John Howard Lawson as a candidate for membership on the executive board of the southern California chapter of the Progressive Citizens of America. An official pamphlet of the organization also listed Mr. Lawson as a sponsor of the second State-wide legislative conference of the Progressive Citizens of America, held on February 15, 1947, in the California Junior High School, Sacramento, Calif.

34. John Howard Lawson has won favor in official Communist circles on a number of occasions. The Communist Party's official organ in this country, the Daily Worker, on October 18, 1935, page 5, lauded Mr. Lawson as one of the persons who have forced the attention of "bourgeois critics" on a left cultural movement which has "established the revolutionary theater in the top flight of dramatic art." The Daily Worker identified the revolutionary theater as one that "claims * * * that the theater is a weapon in the class struggle." On June 8, 1947, page 11, the Daily Worker carried a sympathetic interview of Mr. Lawson by the Daily Worker's film critic, David Platt. Two of Mr. Lawson's plays, *Marching Song* and *Saga Center*, were heralded in *International Literature*, No. 6, 1935, page 104. *International Literature* is the official organ of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, which has its headquarters in Moscow.

35. The writings of John Howard Lawson himself have indicated his closeness to the Communist Party. In an article in *New Theater* magazine, November 1934, page 12, Mr. Lawson bluntly asserts that "as for myself, I do not hesitate to say that it is my aim to present the Communist position, and to do so in the most specific manner." "This is what I believe to be a correct approach," he writes. His article was concerned with the technique and approach of playwrights.

Mr. Lawson stresses the influence on playwrighting by Marx and Engels, the founders of the Communist philosophy, in his book *Theory and Technique of Playwriting*, published in New York in 1936. On pages 45 through 48 he describes

the theories of Marx and Engels as they affect playwriting and challenges criticism which has been leveled against the theories. "The success of the Russian Revolution, and the rapid economic and cultural growth of the Soviet Union, have centered the world's attention on the theories of Marx," Mr. Lawson also points out.

The rise of the revolutionary theater is hailed by Mr. Lawson in an article which appeared in the New Theater magazine for June 1, 1934, pages 6 and 7. Mr. Lawson criticizes Broadway theater productions, saying that "Broadway is sick because it represents a sick bourgeoisie * * *" and predicting that "the reactionary theater will continue to show signs of decay * * *". He states that the "revolutionary theater is on the threshold of its vital growth" and asserts that "creative work draws its whole inspiration and meaning from the vital forces of its period; in our day, the vital forces at work are the growing strength of the revolution, the upsurge of a new class * * *". Mr. Lawson concludes at another point that "there is only one direction in which the drama can move forward: it must join the march of the advancing working class; it must keep pace with the quickening momentum of the revolution."

The Communist Party line was also advanced in the screen play which Mr. Lawson wrote for the movie, Blockade, according to the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its 1945 report, page 118.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the investigators suspend for just a minute?

John Howard Lawson refused to answer the question, "Are you a member of the Communist Party or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?" and other questions put to him. Therefore, it is the unanimous opinion of this subcommittee that John Howard Lawson is in contempt of Congress.

Therefore, this subcommittee recommends to the full committee that John Howard Lawson be cited for contempt of Congress and that appropriate resolutions be referred to the House of Representatives.

The committee will go into recess now. The next witness at 2 o'clock will be Mr. Eric Johnston.

(Thereupon, at 11:50 a. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTER RECESS

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

The first witness will be Mr. Eric Johnston. Mr. Johnston, take the stand, please.

(Mr. Eric Johnston, accompanied by Mr. Paul V. McNutt, counsel, Motion Picture Association, take places at witness table.)

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Johnston, are you represented by counsel?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you desire counsel?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. McNutt has been hired by the Motion Picture Association. He is here with me.

Mr. STRIPLING. As a witness, do you desire counsel?

Mr. JOHNSTON. As a witness, I do not need counsel.

Mr. STRIPLING. For what purpose will Mr. McNutt serve?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. McNutt represents the association. I think it is wise for him to stay here with me.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are the witness.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. And you don't desire counsel yourself?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, if he would feel any better by having Mr. McNutt next to him, why, it will be all right for Mr. McNutt to sit next to him.

Mr. JOHNSTON. He may need to hold my hand, Mr. Stripling.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead with the questioning. Identify the witness and the counsel.

TESTIMONY OF ERIC ALLEN JOHNSTON

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Johnston, will you state your full name and present address?

Mr. JOHNSTON. My name is Eric Allen Johnston. My home is in Spokane, Wash. My present address is 3101 Woodland Drive, Washington, D. C.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I was born in Washington, D. C., December 21, 1895.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present occupation?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am president of the Motion Picture Association of America.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you explain to the committee what the Motion Picture Association of America is?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Motion Picture Association of America includes the larger companies in the motion-picture industry. Would you like me to name them?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes; I would.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Warner Bros., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Twentieth-Century-Fox, RKO, Columbia, International-Universal, Goldwyn—I think I have mentioned them all.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Johnston, beginning last Monday, the committee opened hearings on alleged Communist infiltration into the motion-picture industry. Last week we heard over 20 witnesses, people who are very prominent in the motion-picture industry—not a bunch of discredited individuals, but I would say people who are tops in their particular field. They came before the committee and made certain allegations which the committee heard, as is the procedure of congressional committees.

Now, you are here today as the spokesman for the Motion Picture Association of America; is that true?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have a statement, I believe, that you would like to read to the committee?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do. May I?

Mr. STRIPLING. I suggest that he submit the statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Will you submit the statement, please?

(Statement handed the chairman.)

Mr. STRIPLING. I further suggest that he be permitted to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnston, this statement is pertinent to the inquiry?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes; it is.

The CHAIRMAN. And the committee is unanimous in permitting you to go ahead and read it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm not here to try to whitewash Hollywood, and I'm not here to help sling a tar brush at it, either.

I want to stick to the facts as I see them.

There are several points I'd like to make to this committee.

The first one is this: A damaging impression of Hollywood has spread all over the country as a result of last week's hearings. You have a lot of sensational testimony about Hollywood. From some of it the public will get the idea that Hollywood is running over with Communists and communism.

I believe the impression which has gone out is the sort of scare-head stuff which is grossly unfair to a great American industry. It must be a great satisfaction to the Communist leadership in this country to have people believe that Hollywood Communists are astronomical in number and almost irresistible in power.

Now, what are the facts? Not everybody in Hollywood is a Communist. I have said before that undoubtedly there are Communists in Hollywood, but in my opinion the percentage is extremely small.

I have had a number of close looks at Hollywood in the last 2 years, and I have looked at it through the eyes of an average businessman. I recognize that as the world's capital of show business, there is bound to be a lot of show business in Hollywood. There is no business, Mr. Chairman, like show business. But underneath there is the solid foundation of patriotic, hard-working, decent citizens. Making motion pictures is hard work. You just don't dash off a motion picture between social engagements.

The great bulk of Hollywood people put their jobs first. But I can assure you you won't find a community in the country where hearts are any bigger or the purses more open when it comes to helping out worthy endeavors. Take any national campaign for the public good, and you'll find Hollywood people contributing their time and their money.

Every other country in the world is trying to build up its motion-picture industry, and I can verify that, having just traveled in 12 countries in Europe where they are all trying to build up their motion-picture industry. These governments are trying to do it through government subsidies and devices of all kinds. The American motion-picture industry grew by its own efforts. It has rejected subsidies and Government assistance. It wants no hand-out from Government. All it asks is a fair shake and a chance to live and to grow and to serve its country without being unfairly condemned and crucified.

I wind up my first point with a request of this committee. The damaging impression about Hollywood should be corrected. I urge your committee to do so in these public hearings.

There is another damaging impression which should be corrected. The report of the subcommittee said that some of the most flagrant Communist propaganda films were produced as the result of White House pressure. This charge has been completely refuted by the testimony before you.

My second point includes another request of the committee.

The report of your subcommittee stated that you had a list of all pictures produced in Hollywood in the last 8 years which contained

Communist propaganda. Your committee has not made this list public. Until the list is made public the industry stands condemned by unsupported generalizations, and we are denied the opportunity to refute these charges publicly.

Again, I remind the committee that we have offered to put on a special showing of any or all of the pictures which stand accused so that you can see for yourselves what's in them. The contents of the pictures constitute the only proof.

Unless this evidence is presented and we are given the chance to refute it in these public hearings, it is the obligation of the committee to absolve the industry from the charges against it.

Now, I come to my third point—a vitally important one to every American and to the system under which we live.

It is free speech.

Now, I've been advised by some persons to lay off it. I've been told that if I mentioned it I'd be playing into the hands of Communists. But nobody has a monopoly on the issue of free speech in this country. I'm not afraid of being right, even if that puts me in with the wrong company. I've been for free speech ever since I first read the lives of great men of the past who fought and died for this principle—and that was in grade school.

There is nothing I can add to what every great American has said on the subject since the founding of the Republic. Our freedoms would become empty and meaningless without the keystone of our freedom arch—freedom of speech—freedom to speak, to hear, and to see.

When I talk about freedom of speech in connection with this hearing, I mean just this: You don't need to pass a law to choke off free speech or seriously curtail it. Intimidation or coercion will do it just as well. You can't make good and honest motion pictures in an atmosphere of fear.

I intend to use every influence at my command to keep the screen free. I don't propose that Government shall tell the motion-picture industry, directly or by coercion, what kind of pictures it ought to make. I am as whole-souledly against that as I would be against dictating to the press or the radio, to the book publishers or to the magazines.

One of the most amazing paradoxes has grown out of this hearing. At one point we were accused of making Communist propaganda by not making pictures which show the advantages of our system. In other words, we were accused of putting propaganda on the screen by keeping it out.

That sort of reasoning is a little staggering, especially when you know the story of American pictures in some foreign countries. We are accused of Communist propaganda at home, but in Communist-dominated countries in Europe our motion-picture films are banned because they contain propaganda for capitalism.

We can't be communistic and capitalistic at one and the same time. I've said it before, but I'd like to repeat it. There is nothing more feared or hated in Communist countries than the American motion picture.

To sum up this point: We insist on our rights to decide what will or will not go in our pictures. We are deeply conscious of the

responsibility this freedom involves, but we have no intention to violate this trust by permitting subversive propaganda in our films.

Now, my next point is this:

When I was before this committee last March, I said that I wanted to see Communists exposed. I still do. I'm heart and soul for it. An exposed Communist is an unarmed Communist. Expose them, but expose them in the traditional American manner.

But I believe that when this committee or any other agency undertakes to expose communism it must be scrupulous to avoid tying a red tag on innocent people by indiscriminate labeling.

It seems to me it is getting dangerously easy to call a man a Communist without proof or even reasonable suspicion. When a distinguished leader of the Republican Party in the United States Senate is accused of following the Communist Party line for introducing a housing bill, it is time, gentlemen, to give a little serious thought to the dangers of thoughtless smearing by gossip and hearsay.

Senator Robert Taft isn't going to worry about being called a Communist. But not every American is a Senator Taft who can properly ignore such an accusation. Most of us in America are just little people, and loose charges can hurt little people. They take away everything a man has—his livelihood, his reputation, and his personal dignity.

When just one man is falsely damned as a Communist in an hour like this when the Red issue is at white heat, no one of us is safe.

Gentlemen, I maintain that preservation of the rights of the individual is a proper duty for this Committee on Un-American Activities. This country's entire tradition is based on the principle that the individual is a higher power than the state; that the state owes its authority to the individual, and must treat him accordingly.

Expose communism, but don't put any American who isn't a Communist in a concentration camp of suspicion. We are not willing to give up our freedoms to save our freedoms.

I now come to my final point:

What are we going to do positively and constructively about combating communism? It isn't enough to be anti-Communist any more than it is to be antismallpox. You can still die from smallpox if you haven't used a serum against it. A positive program is the best anti-toxin for the plague of communism.

Communism must have breeding grounds. Men and women who have a reasonable measure of opportunity aren't taken in by the prattle of Communists. Revolutions plotted by frustrated intellectuals at cocktail parties won't get anywhere if we wipe out the potential causes of communism. The most effective way is to make democracy work for greater opportunity, for greater participation, for greater security for all our people.

The real breeding ground of communism is in the slums. It is everywhere where people haven't enough to eat or enough to wear through no fault of their own. Communism hunts misery, feeds on misery, and profits by it.

Freedoms walk hand-in-hand with abundance. That has been the history of America. It has been the American story. It turned the eyes of the world to America, because America gave reality to freedom, plus abundance when it was still an idle daydream in the rest of the world.

We have been the greatest exporter of freedom, and the world is hungry for it. Today it needs our wheat and our fuel to stave off hunger and fight off cold, but hungry and cold as they may be, men always hunger for freedom.

We want to continue to practice and to export freedom.

If we fortify our democracy to lick want, we will lick communism—here and abroad. Communists can hang all the iron curtains they like, but they'll never be able to shut out the story of a land where freemen walk without fear and live with abundance.

[Applause.]

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Johnston, I noticed on the first page of your statement you stated:

I have had a number of close looks at Hollywood in the last 2 years. I have looked at it through the eyes of an average businessman.

Now, during these looks, did you find present within Hollywood or the motion-picture industry any Communists or any evidence of Communist infiltration?

MR. JOHNSTON. I have been told, Mr. Stripling, that there were Communists in Hollywood. I have been told that the motion-picture Screen Writers Guild had Communists. Therefore, I went and talked to the Screen Writers Guild. I laid it on the line to them, and I said to them—

MR. STRIPLING. Just a moment. Why did you go?

MR. JOHNSTON. Because I had been told that there were Communists in the Screen Writers Guild.

MR. STRIPLING. You had just been told that?

MR. JOHNSTON. That is right.

MR. STRIPLING. You made no effort to determine whether they were there or not?

MR. JOHNSTON. Mr. Stripling, I have no way of making any definite determination. Who is going to prove that a man is a Communist?

MR. STRIPLING. I think this committee is going to prove it.

MR. JOHNSTON. All right, sir, but I am not this committee, Mr. Stripling.

MR. STRIPLING. I wouldn't be surprised. From the statements you have been making in the last few days, you certainly attempted to run it.

THE CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Mr. Johnston, I would just like to review the course of this investigation.

I can remember when I was first on the old Dies committee. There was talk then of communism out in Hollywood. The committee sent out investigators. The committee itself went out there. They interviewed a number of people. Later, under the chairmanship of, I think it was Mr. Wood, investigators went out to Hollywood. I believe a subcommittee went out there.

I can't speak for what they found, because I don't know what they found. I can't say why the investigation was concluded or postponed or not followed up. But I do know something about what has happened this year.

We sent a subcommittee out to Hollywood. We heard many witnesses, most of them prominent in their own field, who gave us voluminous testimony as to the Communist infiltration in Hollywood. We

reported then back to our full committee. But what the full committee decided to do was not just based on that subcommittee's report. The full committee this year determined on an eight-point program, to investigate communism in various fields of endeavor. It wasn't just Hollywood. It was in the labor unions, in education, in atomic energy, in the Government itself, and in other things. Then we started out.

Now, we expected—and you told us, I believe—that we would get the full cooperation from you and your organization.

(Mr. Johnston shaking head affirmatively.)

The CHAIRMAN. But I just wouldn't want to tell the kind of cooperation that we have been getting.

But I do want to cite two or three things to you, that make me boil a little bit. We had some very prominent persons in this country who, either through you are someone you are associated with, contacted and got in touch with us and asked us to lay off or postpone it. Then we had people get in touch with us—persons of dubious character, too, some of them—asking us not to put on a certain witness, or would we refrain from asking certain questions—

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Just a minute.

You have made a statement, and I would just like to say a few words.

Mr. JOHNSTON. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Because I think this is pertinent to this inquiry, while you are on the stand.

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And then we have had others get in touch with some of our investigators who tried all the tricks of the trade, to find out what we were going to do. One man went so far as to—he didn't offer anything, but I want to tell you he gave all the signs of an offer, all the signs of an offer.

Then your counsel, as to whom you are a little undecided, whether you should have him sitting with you today—

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Your counsel has given out a statement, on the hour and off the hour, critical of our committee.

I was informed this morning that this moving picture that has appeared at the Trans-Lux, at which I said a few words and you said a good many—I understand that you made that statement 2 and 3 weeks before this hearing started.

Now, is that the kind of cooperation that you promised originally? I want to tell you something. If that is cooperation, Mr. Johnston, I just don't understand the meaning of the word. Go ahead.

Mr. JOHNSTON. May I answer you, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I would be glad to have you.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I told you we'd give you cooperation, and we have, Mr. Chairman. No member of this association or no one connected directly with it has ever appeared before you to ask for witnesses to be excused or to postpone this hearing. When I found out that one witness had asked, I immediately requested that he write you a letter and offer to appear. At no time have we refused to give Mr. Strippling information, or to counsel with him. I think that I have given you every cooperation that you have asked for, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that your answer?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I don't know of any time that you have asked for anything that I haven't given it to you.

The CHAIRMAN. That is your answer?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, I might add, Mr. Chairman, in that connection that I believe you requested copies of some resolutions which Mr. Johnston took with him to Hollywood when he appeared before the motion-picture producers regarding this very question of communism and called upon them to take a stand regarding the removal of Communists within the industry.

I believe that you called on his representatives—not once, but probably three times—to produce those resolutions.

Mr. Johnston did not see fit to do so, and finally was forced to do so by subpoena.

Now, isn't that correct, Mr. Johnston?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is absolutely incorrect.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is incorrect?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I was never asked to give you any minutes, to my knowledge, at any time. When you did ask, I showed them to you immediately.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. I can distinctly recall having in my office one of your aides, Mr. Bryson is his name——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Bryson and Mr. Cahill.

The CHAIRMAN. And Mr. Cahill. It is my understanding that Mr. Stripling was present.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I made that request. I made that request once to them in my office. Then I made the request to them over the telephone. I don't know how many times I made the request. But I made the request many times.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. Chairman, I never heard of the request. I called Mr. Stripling up and asked to have a talk with him and show him the whole works. I don't know what more you want.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, suppose——

Mr. JOHNSTON. And I have them with me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Suppose we go into those resolutions now, at this time, Mr. Johnston.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I will be very glad to.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if you made a request from one of my employees and it wasn't transmitted to me. I knew nothing of it. [Examining documents.] In the first place, this is the subpoena. Do you want that, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. I will introduce it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. All right, sir.

Then——

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Johnston. I will put this in the record. This subpoena, Mr. Chairman, was issued on September 29, calling upon Mr. Johnston to appear before the committee and to bring with him copies of all resolutions proposed or submitted relating to the investigation of the movie industry by the Committee on Un-American Activities, and original minutes pertaining to all minutes

held by the Motion Picture Association of America relating to such resolutions, for the period May 1 through September 30, 1947.

I ask that be received as an exhibit.⁵¹

Mr. JOHNSTON. I went to Hollywood and made to the Motion Picture Producers Association a three-point program which I suggested they adopt. They adopted two of the points. The third, which is the second in this statement, they did not adopt.

If you would like, you may introduce this into evidence. And I would be glad to read it, if I may, or if you want it read.

Mr. STRIPLING. I ask that he read this, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSTON (reading):

Suggestions were made. The Association of Motion Picture Producers today were asked to adopt a three-point program to meet the issue of communism in Hollywood and to secure a fair and dignified representation of the facts on the motion-picture industry to the American people. The program proposed that:

1. Insistence upon a fair and objective investigation by the Thomas Un-American Committee. Vague blanket charges that communism had captured the American screen before responsible witnesses have been heard by the entire committee is not in the American tradition. Nothing can be accomplished by smearing all of Hollywood with the brush of communism. Script burning and head hunting are un-American techniques. We want the facts, hard, specific facts, and that kind of an investigation we invite.

We want the facts so that we will know whether we are exonerated or condemned.

Our industry is determined at this time that we shall have a complete and decisive investigation. This must be an investigation to end all investigations in Hollywood.

Hollywood is weary of being the national whipping boy for congressional committees. We are tired of having irresponsible charges made again and again and again and not sustained. If we have committed a crime we want to know it. If not, we should not be badgered by congressional committees.

We are a responsible industry and we would like to spend our time making pictures and not dissipate our energies and our efforts in responding to committee investigations.

2. Agreed not to employ proven Communists in Hollywood jobs where they would be in a position to influence the screen. Hollywood producers recognize the responsibility to keep the American screen free from Communists or any other subversive propaganda. The evidence is conclusive that Communists are a destructive force and their constant undercover activities are designed to create chaos and conflict.

We reject the Communist not because of his ideas but because of his allegiance and loyalty to a foreign power. Every American Communist is a potential foreign agent. America has never been afraid of new ideas. We welcome them in all fields, political, economic, and social.

The free play of ideas is the strength of our democracy. It is the competition of ideas which makes America strong. Sedition is not competition, and this industry will not tolerate seditionists; but we must make sure we do not chip away our freedoms to get the seditionists.

The protection of the innocent is still supreme. There is no higher duty under our American system of jurisprudence. We must be scrupulous to avoid indiscriminate labeling. Every time you tag an innocent person with a red label you play into the hands of the Communists.

I am not interested in the pastel shades, the parlor pinks or salmon-colored zealots. They are just plain dupes and fools. My concern is the Red conspirator, the man who uses the freedoms of democracy to destroy democracy.

We emphasize that in agreeing not to employ proven Communists we mean just that. The proof must be conclusive and it is the responsibility of the Un-American Committee to furnish the proof and the names.

3. The employment of James Byrnes, former Secretary of State, to represent the Association of Motion Picture Producers in counseling and presenting all the facts about the industry to the Un-American Committee and the American public.

⁵¹ See appendix, p. 539, for exhibit 64.

The record of the motion-picture industry in war and peace is unexcelled by any other industry.

Many Americans see motion pictures daily. They not only see them, they recommend them, and they love them. That is true in every country which permits the showing of American films. We enjoy the highest prestige and standing everywhere.

American films are vital to the American design of living because they give the lie by visual evidence to totalitarian propaganda. Our pictures produced under the democratic form of government inevitably reflect democratic habits of thought and life and action. They are bound to convey some of the virility, the zest, and joy of living which are characteristic of life in our country. These are qualities which other people need most at this time, and these are the qualities that make American films hated and feared by Communists everywhere. American motion pictures truly reflecting American life have been possible because of freedom of the screen. We intend to protect this sacred right. We are determined not to permit Communist propaganda, Government pressure, or political censorship to undermine that freedom.

Mr. Chairman, the Association of Motion Picture Producers at Los Angeles adopted the first and the third. They did not adopt the second. The second is the agreement not to employ proven Communists in Hollywood on jobs where they would be in a position to influence the screen. They did not adopt that for several, what they thought, were very good reasons.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you pardon me just a moment?

Mr. JOHNSTON. May I complete?

Mr. STRIPLING. Complete your statement?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes, certainly.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The first reason assigned was that for us to join together to refuse to hire someone or some people would be a potential conspiracy, and our legal counsel advised against it.

Second, who was going to prove whether a man was a Communist or not? Was it going to be by due process of law in the traditional American manner, or was it to be arrogated to some committee in Hollywood to say he was a Communist, or some producer, and if they said he was a Communist they might at some future time find he was a Republican, a Democrat, or a Socialist, and not hire him.

In other words, who is going to prove that this man was a Communist? And under what methods?

Third, that it was the duty of Congress to determine two things: First, was a Communist an agent of a foreign government—as I believe he is—and/or second, is he attempting to overthrow our Government by unconstitutional means. Therefore, it was up to Congress to make these two determinations before we could take action.

I must confess they convinced me they were right on all three points, Mr. Chairman, and that is the reason they did not attempt No. 2.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you urge the adoption of No. 2?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I did; I urged the adoption of No. 2 but the questioning from our legal counsel present, and from the membership present, convinced me I was wrong.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did they adopt the resolution with reference to Mr. Byrnes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. They did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was Mr. Byrnes appointed?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Then why is Mr. McNutt substituting for Mr. Byrnes?

Mr. JOHNSTON. It was thoroughly understood when we employed Mr. Byrnes that Mr. Byrnes would not appear before any Congressional committee; that he would be glad to advise and counsel us on the outside, but he would not appear before congressional committees. Mr. McNutt was selected, I believe at the suggestion of Mr. Byrnes, to appear before the congressional committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Mr. Byrnes go to Hollywood?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He did. Not with me, however; he went at a subsequent time.

Mr. STRIPLING. Whom did he go with?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He went with Mr. O'Hara, as I recall it, and Mr. Cheyfitz, one of my assistants.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cheyfitz?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is his full name?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Edward Cheyfitz.

Mr. STRIPLING. Edward T. Cheyfitz?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Right.

Mr. STRIPLING. What position does he hold in your organization?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He is one of my assistants.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is he first assistant or second assistant?

Mr. JOHNSTON. My first assistant is Mr. O'Hara. We have no rank from there on. We have several other assistants.

Mr. STRIPLING. He is one of your top assistants?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He is one of my assistants.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was Mr. Cheyfitz, to your knowledge, ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes; he was.

Mr. STRIPLING. For how long?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not know, but he was at one time a member of the Communist Party. He went to Russia, became thoroughly disillusionized, and resigned from the Communist Party.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did he become thoroughly disillusionized?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think it was in 1939.

Mr. STRIPLING. 1939?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Right.

Mr. STRIPLING. Then he was disillusionized when he was engaged in the American peace mobilization in front of the White House; isn't that right?

Mr. Chairman, I have here the Daily Worker of February 18, 1941, which is during the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact. It has a headline, "H. R. 1776 spells dictatorship. Deceit. Not amend it. Urged by 125 prominent Americans in letters to Senators. List of signers of letter condemning war powers bill."

I should like to point out it was the party line at that time to oppose lend-lease, conscription, and other preparatory measures. Among the signers of those condemning the war powers bill was Edward T. Cheyfitz.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you spell that name?

Mr. STRIPLING. C-h-e-y-f-i-t-z.

I have here the Daily Worker of May 29, 1941, during the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact:

Unions in American peace mobilization reply to F. D. R., will defend peace. American peace mobilization says "talk violates will of overwhelming majority of

people." Edward T. Cheyfitz, national executive secretary of the National Casting Workers said, "Our national union continues its opposition to convoys. The President's speech indicates he is ready to send convoys to Britain and enter the shooting stage and naval warfare. Regardless of President's speech we will not change our minds on the fact that our true defense of America must be based on the defense of labor's rights, including the right to strike. Just as Americans have always fought for their rights we shall fight now for labor's rights."

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cheyfitz was very instrumental in some of these strikes during the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact.

Do you think he was disillusionized in 1939 when Hitler marched into Russia?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am not here to defend Mr. Cheyfitz. He is in the city. I would suggest you call him to the stand and talk to him.

I do know, according to Mr. Cheyfitz, he joined the Young Communist League in 1932 when he was 18 years old, broke with the Communists late in 1939 following the Hitler-Stalin pact. Because of articles and speeches in behalf of national defense and preparedness, then being fought by the Communists, Mr. Cheyfitz was attacked in the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party. On August 25, 1940, this Communist newspaper accused Mr. Cheyfitz of being an advocate of "the war program of Wall Street and its candidates Roosevelt and Willkie." It also charged him with accepting "the class collaboration policy of Hillman and Green."

Mr. Cheyfitz joined the association on January 1, 1946. This occasioned further blasts at Mr. Cheyfitz in the Columns of the Daily Worker.

Prior to joining the association, Mr. Cheyfitz was national chairman of the CIO's casting division of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union, and was actively associated with the anti-Communist forces in CIO.

Now, before employing Mr. Cheyfitz I investigated him very thoroughly with a number of people and to refresh that investigation I secured a number of letters recently from people including such men—and I would like——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnston, how long ago did you receive those letters?

Mr. JOHNSTON. One of them is dated October 20, 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. You sort of had a pretty good suspicion, then, that something was coming up?

Go ahead, read the letters.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Knowing Mr. Stripling, I prepared for anything. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSTON. One is from the bishop, Rt. Rev. Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo——

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a minute——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Before you read these letters of recommendation, which seem to be dated rather recently, did you make an investigation before you employed Mr. Cheyfitz?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I did, yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. What did your investigation disclose?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The fact that he had been a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did he become a member?

Mr. JOHNSTON. 1932, when he was 18 years old.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where did he go to school?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I think the University of Michigan?

Mr. STRIPLING. Was he a Communist while he was at the University of Michigan?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I can't answer that. Why don't you call him over and ask him these questions?

Mr. STRIPLING. You said you investigated him before you employed him.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, you say he went to Russia?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where he studied for a year. What year did he go to Russia?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I don't remember the exact dates.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where did he study when he went to Russia?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He worked in Russia as a laborer, I believe, and worked in many parts of Russia. He became completely disillusioned with the whole system.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did he return from Russia?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I do not recall.

Mr. STRIPLING. I thought you said he was disillusionized in 1939?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He was. He returned prior to that time, I think.

Mr. STRIPLING. I thought you said he got disillusionized when he was in Russia?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, but I cannot give you the exact date when he returned, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. You said you made an investigation before you employed him.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I did, and at that time I knew. If you want me to get the exact information I will be very happy to get it for you.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is the nature of Mr. Cheyfitz' duties with the association, with your organization, what does he do?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He handles a number of matters for the organization, principally visual education. Our program of visual education, he is in charge of. He does a lot of other jobs in the organization.

Mr. STRIPLING. Does he have anything to do with labor relations within the motion picture industry?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He has nothing to do with labor relations within the motion picture industry.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you care to give the committee the special qualifications which you felt Mr. Cheyfitz had for the work he does?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes. He is, in my opinion, a very brilliant young fellow; an indefatigable worker; tremendously interested in education and problems of education. I felt he would be an ideal man for the program of visual education we are carrying on because we are expending a considerable sum of money on experimenting with the type and kind of films that can best teach children.

In other words, can you teach children better with black and white films or with colored films? Should they have music or be without music? Should the teacher teach as the film goes along or should the visual work be on the film itself?

We have given a grant of \$50,000 to Yale University for experiments along that line alone, and Yale is now experimenting.

A number of other things——

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you——

Mr. JOHNSTON. I beg your pardon?

Mr. STRIPLING. Go right ahead.

Mr. JOHNSTON. A number of other things in visual education experiments which we were conducting, and I felt Mr. Cheyfitz was able to do it.

Mr. STRIPLING. When you employed Mr. Cheyfitz were you aware that there was sworn testimony before a committee of Congress that he was a member of the Communist Party? That his mother was a member of the Communist Party? That they had both been members of the Communist Party for some time?

Mr. JOHNSTON. He told me he was a member of the Communist Party. I assumed that was sufficient.

Mr. STRIPLING. That made no difference to you?

Mr. JOHNSTON. After getting the recommendations I did about him and for him, I felt he was a man that could be well employed.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you read the recommendations you got before you employed him?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The recommendations I received before I employed him were verbal recommendations, on the phone. I had talked on the phone with many of these people.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you care to give the committee the names of the persons who recommended him before you employed him?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes. Mr. John Biggers, president of one of the big glass companies—Owens-Illinois, is it not?

Mr. McNUTT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co. at Toledo, who intimately knew Mr. Cheyfitz.

Mr. Bill Hard, who was a writer for the Reader's Digest, whom I have known for a long time.

Mr. STRIPLING. You had no written recommendations for him before——

Mr. JOHNSTON. Not at that time; no.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, do you want the recommendations which he obtained recently?

The CHAIRMAN. The ones he received in the last 2 or 3 days?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, in the last couple of weeks, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I think they ought to go in the record.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
Toledo, Ohio, October 20, 1947.

Mr. ERIC JOHNSTON,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. JOHNSTON: In view of the close personal and official association of Mr. Edward Cheyfitz with you in the motion-picture industry, I am writing in order to offer my recommendation of Mr. Cheyfitz as a person deserving public trust and confidence. Mr. Cheyfitz for many years was active in labor circles here in Toledo, and was at one time a member of the Communist Party. I know definitely that Mr. Cheyfitz as a result of his own experience within the party, and as a result of close study of their policies and purposes, reached the con-

viction that he could not conscientiously, or as a loyal American citizen, continue his membership in the party.

He broke definitely with them in the late thirties and this fact was well known here in the city of Toledo. Mr. Cheyfitz subsequently established a fine public record as a trustworthy union officer and as a citizen interested in public affairs. He was largely instrumental in organizing the Toledo plan for the elimination of industrial strife. I am convinced of the complete sincerity of Mr. Cheyfitz and of his rejection of the Communist doctrine and party membership.

It seems to me that it would be contrary to sound ethical principles if a person who has voluntarily repudiated the Communist philosophy on his own initiative and as a result of sincere conviction should be subjected to discrimination and unfavorable criticism because of an earlier mistaken judgment or allegiance. The entire doctrine concerning the validity of moral conversion would be placed in jeopardy if one's past record or mistakes were to militate against the sincerity of present convictions.

I am please therefore to repeat my endorsement of Mr. Cheyfitz as a person worthy of public trust and of high personal character.

Sincerely yours,

Most Rev. KARL J. ALTER, D. D.,
Bishop of Toledo.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE,
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL ACTION, NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., October 22, 1947.

MR. ERIC JOHNSTON,
MOTION PICTURE PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington 6, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: My attention was called to certain charges being made against Edward Cheyfitz, currently associated with your office. It has been stated that Mr. Cheyfitz is a Communist sympathizer and is using his position to promote subversive ideas in the motion-picture industry. May I state that I have known Mr. Cheyfitz well for years and can testify that he is presently strongly anti-Communist. These are not merely his private sentiments, but he has aided forces in the labor movement which are trying to fight Communist control there. I believe it would be a great injustice to hold against him his former association with the party. On the contrary, he is to be commended for his integrity in breaking these connections and in fighting the group whose disloyalty he discovered. I sincerely hope that you will take no heed of the vicious rumors being circulated and that you will continue to trust Mr. Cheyfitz implicitly.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

REV. JOHN F. CRONIN, S. S.,
Assistant Director.

PROGRESSIVE METALWORKERS COUNCIL OF THE INDUSTRIAL UNION OF
MARINE AND SHIPBUILDING WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO,
Waterbury 5, Conn., October 21, 1947.

MR. ERIC JOHNSTON,
President, Motion Picture Association,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: It has been called to my attention that some question has been raised as to the political affiliations of your assistant, Mr. Edward Cheyfitz.

I have known Mr. Cheyfitz for a number of years, particularly while Mr. Cheyfitz was a member of the executive board of the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers. I was at that time a member of the same union, and I was quite familiar with the position of Mr. Cheyfitz on many problems concerning the union.

For some time before he resigned from office in the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Mr. Cheyfitz was strongly opposed to the activities of a number of other officers whom we have good reason to believe were following the dictates of the Communist Party. Mr. Cheyfitz not only expressed his opposition to these people verbally, but he gave considerable assist-

ance to the campaign that finally led to their exposé by the National CIO itself.

I have also known Mr. Cheyfitz since his resignation from office in the international union, and I am convinced that he continues to oppose the philosophy of the Communist Party and its harmful activities in every possible way. I believe that Mr. Cheyfitz is thoroughly opposed to communism and all its works.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. DRISCOLL,
Progressive Metalworkers Council Chairman.

HEALD POND CAMPS,
Jackman, Maine, October 20, 1947.

DEAR ERIC: I understand some questions have been raised about Eddie Cheyfitz and communism. How ridiculous. How stupid.

Everybody knows that Eddie for a few years in his early youth was associated with the Communists. But everybody also knows that he soon brought himself to a true insight into them and left them and became the outstanding fighter against Communism in the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers' Union.

Many of the most valuable anti-Communists in America are ex-Communists. I need only mention Louis Budenz, now a professor in the Roman Catholic University called Fordham in New York City, and Max Eastman, now an editor of that magazine most hated by Communists, the Reader's Digest.

My God! Do we who believe in private capitalism want to make converts from among the Communists or do we want them all to keep on being Communists? Saul of Tarsus persecuted the early Christian Church. How about an investigation of Paul to prove that he came from Tarsus and that his name was really Saul and to take his epistles out of the Bible?

I once talked about Eddie with a leading investigator of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. He said:

"I would rather have one ex-Communist, who understands Communists and their methods, fighting communism than a thousand industrialists who, when they are talking about communism, just simply don't know what they are talking about and just simply pound the empty air."

I think he was quite right. I have never heard any industrialist expose communism as effectively as Louis Budenz or Max Eastman or Eddie Cheyfitz.

Eric, I know Eddie through and through. I have been with him at work and at play, in hours when he was on guard and in hours when he was off guard. I think I know every wrinkle of his mind and heart. I am a Republican. I have served the Republican National Committee. I have broadcast, night after night, week after week, for Republican candidates for President. Ask Alf Landon about my Republicanism when many Republicans did not want to stand up and be counted for fear of New Deal reprisals. And I am a Roman Catholic. Do you think that, with my political principles and my religious convictions, I would back a Communist?

I did back, I do back, and I will always back Eddie. In my opinion it is impossible for anybody to be a more loyal and devoted American than Eddie is today—and will be tomorrow. We shall need men like him for tomorrow's great world-wide show-down. Let us not tear him down. Let us build him up.

Yours in all friendship,

BILL HARD.

LIBBEY-OWENS-FORD GLASS Co.,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Toledo, Ohio, October 24, 1947.

MR. ERIC JOHNSTON,

*President, Motion Picture Association, Inc.,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR ERIC: I understand that there is a possibility that the House Committee on Un-American Affairs might want to question Eddie Cheyfitz because of his former affiliation with the Communist Party. In view of that possibility, I thought a statement from me might be helpful to you, to him, and perhaps also to the committee.

I've only known Mr. Cheyfitz for about 2½ years but my association with him as a member of the Labor-Management Citizens Committee of Toledo, and

subsequently, convinces me that he is unquestionably a patriotic American. I understand that he changed his views on communism and broke with the Communists in about 1940. I am reliably informed that the FBI thoroughly investigated his record during the war and found no grounds for doubting his loyalty.

As you know, he was an able and aggressive labor leader for a number of years, but while a member of the Labor-Management-Citizens Committee, his viewpoint was generally constructive; and in my opinion, he made a notable contribution to its early success.

Sincerely,

JACK BIGGERS.

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington 6, D. C., October 20, 1947.

Mr. ERIC A. JOHNSTON,

Motion Picture Association, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ERIC: It has come to my attention that certain rumors are being deliberately circulated reflecting on the loyalty to this country of Edward T. Cheyfitz; in other words, that Mr. Cheyfitz entertains a compromising stand on communism. I have no hesitation in stating that I have worked with Eddie Cheyfitz and that he has my complete confidence with regard to his loyalty to our Government and his opposition to communism. It has been more than 5 years to my direct knowledge since he had even a remote connection with the Communist movement, and I think there is ample proof that he has, through those years, incurred the active opposition of Communists at every turn.

Our whole theory of government contemplates the making of good citizens. The outstanding qualification of a good citizen is that he be committed to the supremacy of individual rights. That doctrine, in my view, has been actively advocated and practiced by Mr. Cheyfitz.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES B. CAREY, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

DOEHLER-JARVIS CORP., EXECUTIVE OFFICES,
New York 16, N. Y., October 21, 1947.

Mr. ERIC JOHNSTON,

President, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSTON: Relative to your inquiry as to the record of Mr. Edward T. Cheyfitz, with our company, I am pleased to advise as follows:

Mr. Cheyfitz entered the employ of the Doehler Die Casting Co. some time in 1935. At that time our factory employees were represented by an independent union known as the National Association of Die Casting Workers. With the advent of the CIO, the National Association of Die Casting Workers became affiliated with this organization. The union representing our employees, like other independent unions, lacked leadership, principles, and stability. As a result, my company found itself in a very precarious position in 1938. I was elected president of the Doehler Die Casting Co. at that time and decided to personally assume charge of our labor-relations policy. In the course of this work I met with the officials of our Toledo union, which included Mr. Cheyfitz, and after pointing out to them the problems that my company faced, we agreed to set up a constructive, cooperative program between the company and the union.

Shortly thereafter, Mr. Cheyfitz was elected to the national leadership of the National Association of Die Casting Workers and in that capacity I had many occasions to confer with Mr. Cheyfitz and to negotiate contracts between the Doehler Co. and his union.

It was during Mr. Cheyfitz' leadership of our union that the Doehler Co. made its greatest progress as the financial records of this company would clearly indicate. During the entire period from 1938 until 1943, when Mr. Cheyfitz resigned his union office and enlisted in the United States Army, not a single hour's work was lost by any of our employees because of labor disputes. Our negotiations and grievance procedure was carried on in a thoroughly dignified manner with beneficial results both for the company and its employees.

I particularly wish to emphasize the fact that the Doehler Co. began to make war materials early in 1940 and prior to Pearl Harbor. Mr. Cheyfitz as repre-

sentative of the union and I, as representative of the company, had a number of occasions to go to Washington and confer with our Government agencies in an effort to speed up production of war materials.

The Doehler Die Casting Co. received one of the first Navy "E" Awards which was granted to our company on December 31, 1941, only a few days after Pearl Harbor. It is evident that the Doehler Co. must have done an outstanding job on war production well before Pearl Harbor in order to receive this recognition.

During the entire war, the Doehler Co. produced 9,336 different parts for the Army and Navy. These parts served practically all of the Government arsenals and some 2,000 industrial plants. Our ability to produce these parts in quantities without loss of a single hour of production time could only have been made possible by the full cooperation of our employees under the constructive leadership of Mr. Cheyfitz.

Should you desire any further information, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Very truly yours,

DOEHLER-JARVIS CORP.,
CHARLES PACK, *Vice President.*

MR. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Johnston—

MR. JOHNSTON. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnston, the dates are on them?

MR. JOHNSTON. All of them; yes, sir.

MR. STRIPLING. I believe you stated Mr. Cheyfitz accompanied Mr. Byrnes to Los Angeles; is that correct?

MR. JOHNSTON. Yes, he went out with Mr. Byrnes.

MR. STRIPLING. Did Mr. Byrnes meet with the Motion Picture Producers while he was in Hollywood?

MR. JOHNSTON. Yes.

MR. STRIPLING. Did they discuss whether or not he was to appear before this committee to represent them?

MR. JOHNSTON. Well, it was understood that he was not to appear before this committee.

MR. STRIPLING. Did he discuss that point with them?

MR. JOHNSTON. I was not there and I could not say. I was in the hospital; I do not know.

Are you trying to prove, Mr. Stripling, that Mr. Cheyfitz is a Communist now? Is that what you are trying to prove?

MR. STRIPLING. No, sir.

MR. JOHNSTON. What is the benefit of this investigation, then?

MR. STRIPLING. I was wondering, in fact I would like to know why Mr. Byrnes withdrew. It was reported in the papers that Mr. Byrnes declined to appear before the committee.

MR. JOHNSTON. Mr. Stripling, that is a completely unfair statement, and it is an unfair question to ask. Mr. Byrnes never withdrew; he never agreed to accept a job to come before this committee.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Johnston, you just read a resolution which you submitted to the Motion Picture Producers when you were in Hollywood, in which they agreed to employ Mr. Byrnes.

MR. JOHNSTON. To advise—

MR. STRIPLING. It was announced in the papers he was to represent your organization with reference to this investigation. There has been no evidence of Mr. Byrnes anywhere connected with it. I just want to know why he is still not in the picture.

MR. JOHNSTON. He is in the picture just as much as he ever was in the picture. He was employed to advise the Motion Picture Producers Association, and he is doing that, and has done it. It was understood

he was not to appear before any congressional committees. He felt that, having been a Member of Congress, he did not wish to do so.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Johnston, I wonder if you would give the committee a brief outline of the functions of your organization with regard to motion pictures. I hand you herewith the Year Book of Motion Pictures which you will find contains the code of production standards as enforced by the Motion Picture Association. I think you could explain these better to the committee than anyone else, so I will ask you to read them and take them up with the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON. This has to do, Mr. Stripling, with the motion-picture code, and that is the code of making motion pictures or what we think is morally fit to be seen on the screen.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Do you wish me to read all of this? It is rather lengthy.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, I was wondering, Mr. Johnston, since you have covered all of this by a code whether or not there is any branch of your association which has as its purpose the detection of propaganda which might be detrimental to our system of government.

Do you have anyone, for example, who checks pictures to determine whether or not they are propaganda for a foreign government, or do they check only from a moral standpoint. How far does your code extend?

Mr. JOHNSTON. The chapters cover particular applications: "Crimes against the law; sex"—you have heard of that, I presume: "vulgarity; obscenity; profanity; costume; dances; religion; locations; national feelings; titles; and repellant subjects."

Now, there is nothing in here about propaganda. We feel that it is the duty of each motion picture producer to determine what goes on the screen, just like it is the duty of each newspaper publisher to determine what goes into a newspaper.

Mr. STRIPLING. You draw a line, however, there with your code, don't you?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We draw a line only on those lines which offend a sense of morals or decency. This is all the code is supposed to cover.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you go ahead and cover some of the other activities of the organization?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have a policy making in foreign fields, which is very important. A large percentage of our revenue, as you know, comes from outside the United States. Policy making in the foreign field is tremendously important and that is the reason this industry is so disturbed, Mr. Chairman, about this inquiry.

We are not allowed to have our motion pictures in Communist countries, and in those countries which dislike communism, such as Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and others, probably now we will not be allowed to have motion pictures down there either, so it is of tremendous financial importance to us abroad, that is, this investigation, Mr. Chairman.

We also cover matters, in addition to the foreign field, that are of more or less interest in the domestic field, such as contributions to organizations, policies to be adopted, and so on. It is under that guise that I made the three recommendations to the Motion Picture Producers Association.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Johnston, you were present this morning when we heard Mr. John Howard Lawson, were you not?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you hear the evidence which was submitted to the committee regarding his Communist affiliations?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you hear the memorandum which was read regarding his Communist affiliations?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. If all of the evidence which was submitted was proved to your satisfaction to be true, would you say Mr. Lawson had any place in the motion-picture industry as a picture writer?

Mr. JOHNSTON. If all of the evidence there is proved to be true, I would not employ Mr. Lawson because I would not employ any proven or admitted Communist because they are just a disruptive force and I don't want them around.

Mr. STRIPLING. They could be a disruptive force within the motion-picture industry; isn't that true?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Of course.

Mr. STRIPLING. Don't you think this committee has an obligation to expose them if they are there?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I have always said that you did, but I have always thought you should do it under the American program of a free and fair trial. I have never objected to your investigating Hollywood. I told you we welcomed it, and we sincerely do. We haven't always welcomed some of the methods you have adopted.

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all of the questions I have at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Johnston, you have gained a very enviable position in America as a private citizen. By that I mean not an official with the Government. I don't think that there is a single soul in all of the United States, or any place else, who thinks that you are in any way associated with communism or anything that might be communistic—and that would, of course, apply to your distinguished counsel.

Last week when the various testimony was being given much evidence was poured into the record here that the producers, whom you represent, apparently became genuinely disturbed at communistic activities in Hollywood, and they testified as to what they tried to do about it—Mr. Mayer and Mr. Warner and Mr. Disney. Some of them testified that some departments of their organizations out there had even been captured, so to speak, by Communists, and they worked valiantly to do something about it—apparently did. The thing that disturbed me about it was your, shall we say, observation, public observations, that the industry has been smeared, or was being smeared, when with almost every word that those gentlemen poured into the record here I thought they did a noble job of acquitting themselves of any connection with this thing in Hollywood.

I am disturbed to thing that you feel that their testimony did anything but advance them in the eyes of the American public. I think that the motion-picture industry has come out of this hearing with a very fine reputation.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am very happy to hear you say so, Mr. McDowell. It is the kind of statement that we like to hear.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, thank you.

There has been testimony here that various figures have been smeared. I have tried to search my mind for the last hour to find out what figures have been smeared. Of course, Mr. Lawson was referred to a number of times and there appears to be ample evidence that it was not a smear, it was the truth.

When the subcommittee went to Hollywood, Mr. Johnston, we were invited there by every element in Los Angeles, not only by all of the various branches of your industry but by the press and the citizens themselves. They made the demand, sir, that we investigate the movie industry, and we did, and it appears to me that the movie industry, with some few exceptions, which apparently you have no control over, has come out of this thing in a splendid fashion. I have heard no smear of any kind—no actual smear that I can recall. Somebody testified here, I forget who it was, that a young lady, whose name slips me at the moment, raised a disturbance at meetings, and the inference was there that she might be a Communist or fellow traveler. I am informed that the young lady has been invited here to testify. So most certainly there is no evidence so far as I can see that the committee is trying to smear Hollywood.

We are not concerned, Mr. Johnston, about trying to direct the kind of pictures that you should make out there. We politicians in Washington know nothing at all about the art of motion pictures. We merely go to them—sometimes to be criticized. You talk about free speech. I am a newspaperman. Many times I have hit the Government over the head and I expect to continue to if I think it is wrong. That is American. I attended, I think, more than any other member of this committee, every meeting that has been held since last January. I have never heard it even remotely discussed or suggested that something be done by the Committee on Un-American Activities to attempt to get Hollywood to make some particular kind of pictures.

Now, it has been testified here by witnesses something about making anti-Soviet pictures or anti-Russian pictures or anti-anything. The very word makes me shudder—anti or pro anything. You are a great American amusement association. It appears to me America is going to keep you that way—not the United States Congress.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. McDowell, may I say just a word? I heartily applaud all you have said and it is the kind of a statement that I am very happy to hear a member of the committee make, it is the type of statement which is a truly American statement, but perhaps you are misinformed about some angles of it.

May I suggest to you that, for instance, when I was on the stand here in March I was asked over and over again, and I have the testimony here before me, why we hadn't made anti-Communist picture, and what were we going to do about making them. I tried, Mr. McDowell, at that time to say that this industry was before a congressional committee in the early 1940's because they said we were warmongering. We don't want to be called again before an investigation, congressional investigating committee, and be called warmongering.

Furthermore, Mr. McDowell, the questions asked me repeatedly, and the questions asked repeatedly of witnesses during this present investi-

gation, have indicated "Are you making anti-Communist pictures and why don't you make them?" Now, we feel that this is the duty and responsibility of the producers just as it is the duty and the responsibility of publishers, Mr. McDowell, to determine what goes in their newspapers.

Mr. McDOWELL. I agree with you, Mr. Johnston.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Thank you.

Mr. McDOWELL. I would like to point out to you that the expression of Members of Congress is more or less like the expression of the American people. Any person can say whatever he wants to say. The expression of the Committee on Un-American Activities—or any other committee—as both of you gentlemen know, is done by agreement. So far as I can discover from the records of this committee the committee by agreement has suggested or directed nothing that you do out there—and so long as I remain a member of it, and I am sure Mr. Thomas and Mr. Vail feel the same way, that won't be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Thank you very much, Mr. McDowell.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I might say, Mr. McDowell, as there are good and bad writers in Hollywood there are sometime different types of Congressmen. We are very glad to find that you are the kind that we like.

Mr. VAIL. I am sorry to see ended so abruptly what promised to be the accomplishment of a very beautiful sort of friendship.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I don't think it is ended.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Johnston, as president of the Motion Picture Producers Association, based upon what you have seen in the hearings to date, based upon the exhibition you saw this morning, do you believe that this investigation of communistic infiltration into the Hollywood scene is warranted?

Mr. JOHNSTON. We welcomed an investigation in Hollywood and we certainly think it is warranted.

Mr. VAIL. I am glad to hear you say that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The thing that perturbs me, Mr. Vail, is, for instance, you had a Mr. Howard Rushmore here to testify, I think you had complete confidence in his integrity, he was a former admitted Communist but had seen the error of his ways, like the Bible says, and reformed—

The CHAIRMAN. May I say we had Mr. Howard Rushmore before us because he was an authority on Communists and we wanted to learn some of the communistic ways.

Mr. JOHNSTON. All right; and you had confidence in his integrity.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have this man because he was an authority on communism?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I had this man because he was an authority on a lot of things.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you have him because he was an authority on communism?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That was one of the reasons, yes; amongst many others.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. VAIL. In the testimony a while ago I gathered the fact that your headquarters or your offices are located here in Washington?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. How much of your time, Mr. Johnston, is spent in Hollywood?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Well, I presume the Hollywood people think not enough—or maybe they think too much. I would say that probably an average of about 2 or 3 weeks out of every 2 months.

Mr. VAIL. I was interested in the picture that I saw shown on the local screens during the past week and especially in your statement to the effect "That we had no responsibility for the political or economic views of any particular individual but we do have a responsibility for what goes on on the screen."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Right.

Mr. VAIL. "We regard that with great care."

You are aware, I presume, of the fact that throughout this country in a great many municipalities we have moving-picture censor boards set up by those municipalities?

Mr. JOHNSTON. That is right.

Mr. VAIL. And they are reviewing pictures every day and I assume that some of them are rejected. Am I right in that assumption?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Occasionally some of them are—and we think usually for foolish reasons, like the one in Memphis because it showed a colored boy in a picture.

Mr. VAIL. That does seem to be just a little bit farfetched.

Mr. McDOWELL. It showed what? I didn't understand that.

Mr. JOHNSTON. We have had them rejected, like the one in Memphis recently, because it showed a colored boy in the picture with some white boys.

Mr. VAIL. He wasn't in the wood pile?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, nor under a chip.

Mr. VAIL. Have you also heard of an organization called the Legion of Decency?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I know them very well.

Mr. VAIL. That organization, as I understand it, was established to screen those pictures which escaped the censor; is that right?

Mr. JOHNSTON. No, I don't believe that is quite accurate, Mr. Vail. I think the Catholic Church has set up a group which they feel are adequate and competent to review American motion pictures and see whether they are the type of pictures which those who belong to the Catholic Church should see. I think it has nothing to do with whether they are adequately censored or not.

Mr. VAIL. How many pictures do you see a week?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would say about one, maybe two. I see as many as I can, that time will permit me to see.

The CHAIRMAN. Your average is not as good as mine.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am glad to hear that, Mr. Chairman. You pay for yours and I don't.

Mr. VAIL. I assume that your attitude with respect to the fact that this investigation is warranted hinges largely upon the fact that this type of investigation must precede the recommendation of a congressional committee for legislation that will afford protection to the American people?

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I have said before that I feel there are two duties of Congress, to prove whether Communists are foreign agents and/or are they trying to upset our Government by unconstitutional means.

I think that is a duty which Congress has to perform. Personally I feel that the Communist Party, if I might philosophize for just a moment, Mr. Vail, I feel that the Communist Party is intellectually and morally bankrupt. I feel that those members in America, who are the dupes of the Communist Party and dance when the Kremlin pull the strings, have had to change their line to cover that tremendous intellectual bankruptcy. The Communist Party is, as the Fascist Party was, based on hate, and the history of the world shows that that is never successful. The Fascist Party was overthrown because it was based on hate. The Communist Party is based on hate—the class struggle—and I don't think the Communist Party can succeed either, Mr. Vail. And, certainly, I think it is the duty of the Congress to point out to the American people the dangers, and I think it is the duty of Congress to determine whether these people are foreign agents or not, and if so, are they attempting to disrupt our Government by unconstitutional means.

MR. VAIL. That is exactly the job in which this committee is now engaged. The motion-picture industry is clearly one factor in the entire group of factors that must be explored by this committee before it can present to the Congress its recommendations for legislation. You and I know that the international situation is tense today, and since we have the statement of no less an authority than Edgar Hoover and former Ambassador William Bullitt, to the effect that the Communist Party is the agent of a foreign power, it certainly is the job of Congress to check into it and be certain that agents of a foreign government are not circulating freely in this country.

MR. JOHNSTON. I think you are right. We welcome that, Mr. Congressman.

MR. VAIL. It is my belief that we are not too far apart in our views. You take the position that we are assuming a hostile attitude toward Hollywood. The labor organizations are going to take the same attitude. The educational groups are going to take the same attitude. We are going to bear the brunt from the citizens of all those groups as we are bearing it today. It takes a strong back to stand that attack made from some sources but by the time we are through I am confident that we will have established the fact that the country is harboring some very dangerous characters and we will be in a position to present evidence that will result in legislation that will give the country a measure of protection against its present nakedness, against the attacks of such enemies.

MR. JOHNSTON. I think that is very wise, Mr. Vail—Mr. Congressman. I want you to understand my position thoroughly in this and the position of the industry. We are under attack. Statements have been made that our pictures contain Communist propaganda. We feel that there is very little if any Communist matter or propaganda in our pictures. Please bear in mind that we are doing business on a world-wide basis and when you hurt us you hurt our pocketbooks world-wide and you hurt the American Nation world-wide, too, because the best conveyor of good will between our Nation and other nations, in my opinion, is the American motion picture. One picture is worth 10,000 words, according to the old Chinese proverb. In many countries they get their ideas of America from American motion pictures. We don't want the feeling to go out to these countries that American

motion pictures contain Communist propaganda and have them excluded in those areas. It would be bad for us financially. We think it would be bad for the American people and bad for the rest of the world if that went out.

We do not attempt, and I have in no way attempted, to criticize the members of the committee. We feel that you are doing a job which has to be done. We have criticized sometimes, Mr. Vail, the methods in which it was done, because we feel that people should not be smeared with communism unless they have a fair trial and opportunity of proving whether they are or not. That is the American tradition, Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. I appreciate that, Mr. Johnston, that it is your job to defend Hollywood, and a job that you are paid to do and I think that that job could not have been placed in better hands.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Thank you, sir.

Mr. VAIL. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, do you have any more questions?

Mr. STRIPLING. I have no more questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Johnston, you have by inference been very critical of the methods of this committee. That is your prerogative. Many other persons have been very critical of our methods. Many have approved them. But this committee is created by law, Public Law No. 601. One of the duties of the committee is to expose. I am not going back over the years but this year we have exposed communism in the labor field, communism in the Government. We have spotlighted persons like Gerhart Eisler, Hanns Eisler—who, incidentally, was employed in the moving-picture industry, and employed at a very large salary—Eugene Dennis, many others over the period of years is the result of exposures in the spotlighting. We have been instrumental in aiding persons like Earl Browder to go to jail, Fritz Kuhn to go to jail, Pelley to go to jail, doing away with the German-American Bund. So I don't see that the moving-picture industry, any more than we will say some other field, has any sanctum sanctorium before it. We are going to continue to expose and if you will just sit around here every day this week you will see more exposure and more spotlighting of Communists than you have ever seen before. What you heard this morning, what you saw this morning, was just typical of what you are going to hear and see all the rest of the week and maybe some of next week—and it makes no difference whether you have got glamour girls out there or whether you have got a lot of funds behind you or not, if there are Communists in that industry we are going to expose them.

I wish to announce that the next witness will be Mr. Roy Brewer, who will be the first witness tomorrow, and we will adjourn until tomorrow.

(Thereupon, at 3:30 p. m., a recess was taken until the following day, Tuesday, October 28, 1947, at 10:30 a. m.)

HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The Committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Messrs. Louis J. Russell, H. H. Smith, Robert B. Gaston, investigators, and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

The record will show that a subcommittee is sitting and those present are Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, and Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Stripling, the first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, before we call the first witness I would like to read into the record a telegram which was received yesterday from Walt Disney, who has previously testified. It says:⁵²

Some confusion has arisen over my testimony regarding the League of Women Voters. My testimony referred to the year 1941, at which time several women represented themselves as being from the League of Women Voters. I want you to know that I had no intention of criticizing the League of Women Voters as of now. Please see that this is read to the committee on Monday and that it is added to my testimony.

WALT DISNEY.

I ask that that be made a part of the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. STRIPLING. The first witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Mr. Dalton Trumbo.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Trumbo, take the stand.

(Mr. Dalton Trumbo, accompanied by Robert W. Kenny and Bartley Crum, counsel, take places at witness table.)

The CHAIRMAN. Raise your right hand, please.

Mr. Trumbo, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. TRUMBO. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF DALTON TRUMBO

Mr. TRUMBO. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement I should like to read into the record, if you please—

⁵² See appendix, p. 539, for exhibit 65.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Trumbo, just a moment, please. We want to conduct the hearing as orderly as possible, and I am sure you desire to cooperate.

Mr. TRUMBO. I do, indeed.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have counsel with you?

Mr. TRUMBO. I have.

Mr. STRIPLING. And would you identify your counsel?

Mr. TRUMBO. Mr. Bartley Crum and Mr. Robert Kenny.

May I request of the Chair the opportunity to read a statement into the record?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. May we see your statement?

Mr. TRUMBO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. To determine whether it is pertinent to the inquiry. (Statement handed to the chairman.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have a copy?

Mr. CRUM (addressing Mr. Trumbo). Do you have an extra copy for Mr. Stripling?

Mr. TRUMBO. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. TRUMBO. I beg your pardon, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Trumbo, we have looked over this statement very carefully. It has been our practice to permit witnesses to read statements that are pertinent to the inquiry, that is, the alleged infiltration of communism in the moving-picture industry.

We have read your statement here. We have concluded, and unanimously so, that this statement is not pertinent to the inquiry. Therefore, the Chair will rule that the statement will not be read.

Mr. TRUMBO. The Chair has considered a statement from Gerald L. K. Smith to be pertinent to its inquiries.

The CHAIRMAN. That statement is out of order.

Mr. TRUMBO. And where is mine different from that, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. As a witness, if you conduct yourself like the first witness yesterday, you won't be given the privilege of being a witness before a committee of Congress, before this committee of Congress.

Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Trumbo—

Mr. TRUMBO. I would like to know what it is that is in my statement that this committee fears be read to the American people?

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Stripling, ask a question—

Mr. TRUMBO. I have some evidence to introduce—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Ask one question, Mr. Stripling—

Mr. TRUMBO. I should like to introduce evidence—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). You are out of order.

Mr. STRIPLING. State your name, please.

Mr. TRUMBO. Dalton Trumbo.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your present address?

Mr. TRUMBO. 329 South Rodeo Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, sir?

Mr. TRUMBO. I was born in Montrose, Colo., on December 9, 1905.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. TRUMBO. My occupation is that of a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been in the motion-picture industry as a writer?

Mr. TRUMBO. I believe since 1934 or '35.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. TRUMBO. At this point, sir, I should like to introduce certain evidence bearing upon this case——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. TRUMBO. I——

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, please——

Mr. TRUMBO. I should like to introduce statements——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Just a minute——

Mr. TRUMBO. About my work——

The CHAIRMAN. What was the question——

Mr. TRUMBO. From General Arnold of the Army Air Forces——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Now, just a minute——

Mr. TRUMBO. From a municipal judge——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Just a moment. The Chair wants to find out what the question was and to see whether your answer is pertinent to the question. What was the question?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Trumbo, I shall ask various questions, all of which can be answered "Yes" or "No." If you want to give an explanation after you have made that answer, I feel sure that the committee will agree to that.

However, in order to conduct this hearing in an orderly fashion, it is necessary that you be responsive to the question, without making a speech in response to each question.

Mr. TRUMBO. I understand, Mr. Stripling. However, your job is to ask questions and mine is to answer them. I shall answer "Yes" or "No," if I please to answer. I shall answer in my own words. Very many questions can be answered "Yes" or "No" only by a moron or a slave.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair agrees with your point, that you need not answer the questions "Yes" or "No"——

Mr. TRUMBO. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But you should answer the questions.

Mr. TRUMBO. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. TRUMBO. May I, if the Chair please, I am not going to make a speech. I simply have evidence from responsible people as to the nature of my work. I have 20 scripts which I propose and wish to introduce into the record so that it may be known what my work is, and what this committee may seek to prevent the American people from seeing in the future.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Now, don't make a statement like that. That is not correct.

May I ask how long one of these scripts may be?

Mr. TRUMBO. I am sorry to say that they average from 115 to 160 or 170 pages, with very few of them of the latter type.

The CHAIRMAN. And how many do you want to put in the record?

Mr. TRUMBO. I have 20. They are not quite all that I have written.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the Chair will have to rule——

Mr. TRUMBO. But, sir——

The CHAIRMAN. They are too long——

Mr. TRUMBO. My work has been under attack.

The CHAIRMAN. Too many pages.

Mr. TRUMBO. Then may I introduce into evidence statements of responsible people concerning my work?

The CHAIRMAN. All right, you let the investigator ask his questions, and then you answer them the best you can.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will be glad to cover all of your works, Mr. Trumbo.

Mr. TRUMBO. I realize that, but yesterday a man's work was covered after he had left the stand. I should like to discuss my work now.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, Mr. Trumbo, I will repeat the question: Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. TRUMBO. I shall answer that question in just a moment. I want only to protest the fact that I have been denied the right to introduce evidence, to introduce statements of General Arnold, of juvenile court judges, of the head of the Motion Picture Division of the UNRRA, of the Naval Chaplain in charge of motion-picture projects for the United States Navy. These I consider pertinent. And with that protest, I shall go to your question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. TRUMBO. Mr. Stripling, the rights of American labor to inviolably secret membership lists have been won in this country by a great cost of blood and a great cost in terms of hunger. These rights have become an American tradition. Over the Voice of America we have broadcast to the entire world the freedom of our labor.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you answering the question or are you making another speech?

Mr. TRUMBO. Sir, I am truly answering the question.

The CHAIRMAN. Because if you want to make another speech we can find a corner right up here where you can make some of these speeches.

Mr. TRUMBO. I would be willing to do that, too.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, now, what was the question, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. The question, Mr. Chairman, is—I asked Mr. Trumbo if he is a member of the Screen Writers Guild.

Mr. TRUMBO. You asked me a question which would permit you to haul every union member in the United States up here to identify himself as a union member, to subject him to future intimidation and coercion. This, I believe, is an unconstitutional question.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, are you making another speech, or is that the answer?

Mr. TRUMBO. This is my answer, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, can't you answer: Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild, by saying "Yes" or "No," or I think so, or maybe, or something like that?

Mr. TRUMBO. Mr. Chairman, I should like to accommodate you. May I try to answer the question again?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we would certainly like to have you accommodate us.

Mr. TRUMBO. If there were a committee of Congress, all the members of which had voted in favor of the Taft-Hartley bill——

Mr. McDOWELL. Oh, that isn't answering the question.

(The chairman pounding gavel.)

Mr. TRUMBO. It might be considered that committee was hostile to labor.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Now, Mr. Trumbo—

Mr. McDOWELL. It is no disgrace, you know, to identify yourself as a member of a labor union in the United States. Most of us belong to something.

The CHAIRMAN. Now the question is, Mr. Trumbo: Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. TRUMBO. Mr. Chairman, I would not consider it a disgrace to be a member of a labor union.

Mr. McDOWELL. Of course he wouldn't.

Mr. TRUMBO. But labor unions have the right to secrecy of their membership lists.

The CHAIRMAN. I am getting back to the question: Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. TRUMBO. Mr. Chairman, this question is designed to a specific purpose. First—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Do you—

Mr. TRUMBO. First, to identify me with the Screen Writers Guild; secondly, to seek to identify me with the Communist Party and thereby destroy that guild—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Are you refusing to answer the questions?

Mr. TRUMBO. I will refuse to answer none of your questions, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you are refusing to answer this question.

Mr. TRUMBO. I am, indeed, not refusing to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. I will ask you the question—

Mr. TRUMBO. You ask me.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. TRUMBO. I repeat—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Excuse the witness—

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TRUMBO. Am I excused?

Mr. STRIPLING. I have more questions—

Mr. TRUMBO. Am I excused, or not?

The CHAIRMAN. No; just a minute. The chief investigator wants to ask some questions.

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment. I have some other questions, Mr. Trumbo, that I would like to ask you.

Are you now, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRUMBO. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to know whether the quality of my last answer was acceptable, since I am still on the stand?

The CHAIRMAN. This hasn't got anything to do with your answer to the last question.

Mr. TRUMBO. I see.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a new question, now.

Mr. TRUMBO. I see.

Mr. Stripling, you must have some reason for asking this question—

Mr. McDOWELL. Yes, we do.

Mr. TRUMBO. You do.

I understand that members of the press have been given an alleged Communist Party card belonging to me—is that true?

Mr. STRIPLING. That is not true.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not asking the question—

Mr. TRUMBO. I was.

The CHAIRMAN. The chief investigator is asking the questions.

Mr. TRUMBO. I beg your pardon, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. TRUMBO. I believe I have the right to be confronted with any evidence which supports this question. I should like to see what you have.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh. Well, you would!

Mr. TRUMBO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you will, pretty soon.

(Laughter and applause.)

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). The witness is excused. Impossible.

Mr. TRUMBO. This is the beginning—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Just a minute—

Mr. TRUMBO. Of an American concentration camp.

The CHAIRMAN. This is typical Communist tactics. This is typical Communist tactics. [Pounding gavel.]

(Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN. Now, there will be no demonstration from the persons in the audience. People in the audience are the guests of this committee. This is a congressional committee and we must maintain order. Those standing up or walking around will please sit down.

Mr. Stripling, put on the next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to place into the record the affiliations of Mr. Trumbo with the Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Louder, please.

Mr. STRIPLING. Which have been compiled by the investigative and research staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I should also like to place a witness on the stand to introduce the Communist registration card of Mr. Trumbo.

Do I have permission to read this memorandum?

The CHAIRMAN. How many pages are there?

Mr. STRIPLING. Like in the case of Mr. Lawson, Mr. Chairman, it is nine pages long.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, will you come up here, please for a minute.

(Mr. Stripling confers with the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Stripling, you read it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, before I read this memorandum, I would like to refer to an article which appeared in the Hollywood Reporter, which is one of the important trade papers of the motion-picture industry, under date of August 2, 1946,⁵³ in which they state:

The reporter herein now asks Trumbo to answer these questions: Are you a Communist? Is your party name or alias Hal Conger? Are you a member of group 3, branch A, of the American Communist Party? Are you the holder of Communist Book No. 36802?

So far as we have been able to determine, Mr. Trumbo has never answered that challenge from the Hollywood Reporter.

⁵³ See appendix, p. 539, for exhibit 66.

According to the International Motion Picture Almanac and other sources available to this committee, Dalton Trumbo was the writer of the following films—there is a long list of films here, Mr. Chairman, and I won't read those unless it is desired.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like to point out, however, that Mr. Trumbo is the author of *Tender Comrade*, about which Mrs. Lela Rogers testified.

(The films are as follows:)

Love Begins at 20, Everybody Cheer, Tugboat 'Princess (Columbia), The Devil's Playground (Columbia, 1937), Fugitives for a Night (RKO, 1938), A Man to Remember (RKO, 1938), Sorority House (RKO, 1939), The Flying Irishman (RKO, 1939), Five Came Back (RKO, 1939), Career (RKO, 1939), The Kid From Kokomo (First National, 1939), Heaven With a Barbed-Wire Fence (Twentieth Century-Fox, 1939), A Bill of Divorcement (RKO, 1940), Curtain Call (RKO, 1940), Kitty Foyle (RKO, 1940), We Who Are Young (RKO, 1940), The Widow Wouldn't Weep (Paramount 1940), Accent on Love (Twentieth Century-Fox 1941), A Guy Named Joe (M-G-M, 1943), Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo, Tender Comrade (RKO, 1943), Jealousy (Republic, 1945), Our Vines Have Tender Grapes (M-G-M, 1945).

Mr. STRIPLING. According to *Variety* of March 14, 1941, page 2, Dalton Trumbo was the author of *Remarkable Andrew*, which was so anti-British and anti-war that Paramount refused to continue with the picture after paying \$27,000 for it. That was written during the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact.

The files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the following information concerning the Communist-front affiliations of Dalton Trumbo:

1. According to the *Hollywood Reporter*, August 22, 1946, well-known trade publication of the motion-picture industry, Dalton Trumbo was asked if he was the holder of Communist Party Book No. 36802. The committee knows of no denial by Mr. Trumbo of this fact. He has, however, openly endorsed Communist candidates, Communist legal defendants, and has openly cooperated with the Communist legal defendants, and has openly cooperated with the Communist Party and its instruments. According to the *Los Angeles Times* of November 2, 1942, Mr. Trumbo endorsed Mrs. La Rue McCormick, Communist candidate for State senator. In a speech quoted in the *Worker* of June 22, 1947, page 11 (magazine), Mr. Trumbo is quoted as follows:

And the defense of the rights of the Communist Party, and of all real or alleged Communists, is the duty not only of liberals and progressives, but all men and women who have love for their country and respect for its Constitution.

At an official meeting of the Communist Party featuring as its chief speaker, William Z. Foster, party chairman, the poem, *Confessional*, by Dalton Trumbo, was presented, according to the *People's World* of September 10, 1947, page 4.

Mr. Chairman, would it be agreeable if a member of my staff read this memorandum?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that is agreeable.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Gaston.

Mr. GASTON (reading):

No. 2. In April 1940, during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact when the Communist Party was actively denouncing President Roosevelt as a warmonger, and agitating against lend-lease and the defense program, the *Daily Worker* published in serial form Dalton Trumbo's antiwar story entitled "Johnny Got His Gun." This book was widely sold at all Communist Party book shops and also extensively circulated at meetings of the American Peace Mobilization. A synopsis of this story appeared in the *People's World* of May 22, 1940, page 8. The story also appeared serially in the *Daily Worker* of April 1940. Both of these papers are official Communist Party organizations. Mr. Trumbo has been a contributor to the *New Masses*, official Communist Party weekly magazine, according to its issues of April 15, 1941, page 13, and September 26, 1941, page 28.

The New Masses has been cited as a Communist periodical by Attorney General Biddle, according to the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942. It has been cited as a Communist magazine by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 24, 1942, and March 29, 1944. According to the People's World of July 16, 1943, Mr. Trumbo was a member of a committee to sell paintings at an auction for the benefit of the New Masses, which was held in Hollywood. Mainstream is a Communist quarterly magazine specializing in the literary field. It is being actively promoted by the official Communist press at the present time. Mr. Trumbo is listed in the winter 1947 issue of Mainstream as a member of its editorial board. It should be noted in this connection that it has been a long-standing practice for Communist publications to utilize only Communists as staff members and frequent contributors.

3. Mr. Trumbo has made it a practice to appear in defense of Communist cases. He defended Harry Bridges, according to the Los Angeles Examiner of May 25, 1941. Bridges was cited as a member of the Communist Party by the Daily Worker, the official Communist organ. Mr. Trumbo was at a testimonial dinner in behalf of Harry Bridges at Park Manor Hotel, Los Angeles, on April 12, 1941, according to the San Diego Labor Union Weekly of April 18, 1941. Jesus Hernandez Tomas, a leading Spanish Communist, was barred from entry to this country by the State Department. Dalton Trumbo enlisted in his defense, according to the People's World of November 30, 1943. Mr. Trumbo was also the author of a pamphlet entitled "Harry Bridges," which was written for defense purposes. According to the New York Times of December 22, 1943, page 40, Mr. Trumbo was a signer of a declaration issued by the so-called Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee honoring George Dimitroff, former general secretary of the Communist International.

4. The American Peace Crusade was organized by the American Peace Mobilization. Attorney General Biddle has stated that: "The most conspicuous activity of the American Peace Mobilization was the picketing of the White House, which began in April 1941, in protest against lend-lease and the entire national defense program. * * * On the afternoon of June 21, 1941, he (Frederick V. Field, national secretary) suddenly called off the picket line around the White House" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942). Mr. Trumbo was a speaker at a mass meeting held under the auspices of the American Peace Crusade on April 6, 1940, according to the New Masses of August 6, 1940, page 22. He was a speaker at a Peace rally at the Los Angeles Olympic Auditorium on April 6, 1940. He was also a speaker for the American Peace Mobilization at the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles on February 24, 1941. Mr. Trumbo was the author of a skit which was presented at a meeting of the American Peace Mobilization in Los Angeles on February 24, 1941.

5. The International Workers Order has been cited by Attorney General Biddle as "one of the strongest Communist organizations" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942). This organization has consistently supported Communist candidates, the Communist press and Communist campaigns. It was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942. According to the People's World of May 28, 1943, page 3, Mr. Trumbo was a speaker for the International Workers Order.

6. The American Youth for Democracy according to the official statements of its leaders, was formerly the Young Communist League. On April 17, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities issued a report on the American Youth for Democracy in which it called upon the governors or legislatures of the various States and the administrative heads of the colleges and universities "to thoroughly expose the Communist connections of the American Youth for Democracy as well as the inimical objectives of the Communist Party in America." The Congressional Record of March 24, 1947, page A-1298, contains a statement made by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in which he spoke of the American Youth for Democracy as the organization "which conceals the evils and the corruption of American communism. This name is but a new one for the former Young Communist League. It reflects all the sinister purposes of the Communist Party of the United States. It employs the same techniques and has the same objectives, namely the conversion of our haven of liberty and freedom to worship as we choose to a godless, totalitarian state where the adversaries of democracy can do as they please." The American Youth for Democracy was also cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944.

According to the letterhead of the American Youth for Democracy for December 1, 1944, Dalton Trumbo was a sponsor.

7. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee is engaged in providing transportation and support for international Communist agents such as Gerhart Eisler. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited for contempt of Congress on April 16, 1946, and its members were convicted in a Federal court on June 27, 1947. According to a letterhead dated February 26, 1946, issued by the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, Mr. Trumbo was a national sponsor. Mr. Trumbo is also listed as a sponsor of a dinner held by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee at the Hotel Astor in New York City on October 27, 1943, according to its printed invitation.

8. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties has been cited by Attorney General Biddle as part of the "Communist solar system" and he stated that "The defense of Communist leaders such as Sam Darcy and Robert Wood, party secretaries for Pennsylvania and Oklahoma, have been major efforts of the federation" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942). This organization has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1944, and March 29, 1944. Mr. Trumbo signed an open letter published by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties under the title of "600 Prominent Americans."

9. The Sleepy Lagoon Defense Committee was an auxiliary of the International Labor Defense, properly termed by Attorney General Biddle as the "legal arm of the Communist Party." According to a letterhead of this Defense Committee, dated August 9, 1944, Mr. Trumbo was a sponsor.

10. The League of American Writers was the American affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow. It has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. It has also been cited as under Communist auspices by Attorney General Biddle in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942. The organization has been pledged to the defense of the Soviet Union and "use of art as an instrument of the class struggle." The Daily Worker of September 5, 1940, page 7, lists Mr. Trumbo as a member of the League of American Writers. The League of American Writers held a conference in Hollywood on June 20-21, 1942. According to the People's World of June 10, 1942, June 17, 1942, Mr. Trumbo was head of one of its speakers panels. According to People's World of March 31, 1943, page 5, Mr. Trumbo lectured at a conference sponsored by the West Coast Chapter of the League of American Writers, during the summer of 1942 in Hollywood. He was also a contributor to a magazine called Clipper published by the League of American Writers.

11. The Writers Congress held on October 1, 2, 3, 1943, was sponsored by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, successor to the Hollywood Branch of the League of American Writers, which has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and by Attorney General Biddle and the Committee for Cultural Freedom, headed by Prof. John Dewey. Mr. Trumbo was an active participant in one of the panels of the Writers Congress, according to the People's World of October 13, 1943, page 5.

12. The Hollywood Writers Mobilization previously known as the Hollywood Chapter of the League of American Writers, arranged a series of forums at the El Patio Theater in Hollywood, beginning December 2, 1946. Mr. Trumbo was a speaker at these forums.

13. The Hollywood Forum was held under the auspices of the Daily People's World, official west coast organ of the Communist Party, according to the Daily Worker of April 15, 1946, page 11. Mr. Trumbo was a speaker at a forum meeting held on April 9, 1946.

14. The Hollywood Democratic Committee was the successor to the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League which was organized by Isaac Romaine, alias V. J. Jerome, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The Hollywood Anti-Nazi League dissolved during the time of the Stalin-Hitler pact. According to the People's World of August 3, 1943, page 38, Mr. Trumbo made a collection speech in behalf of the Hollywood Democratic Committee.

15. The Motion Picture Democratic Committee was cited as a Communist front by the California Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities in the 1943 report, and by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on September 2, 1947. Melvin Douglas and Philip Dunne resigned from the executive board on the Motion Picture Democratic Committee because of its Communist control. According to the bulletin of the Motion Picture Democratic

Committee, dated March 26, 1940, Mr. Trumbo was a speaker at its meeting held on April 6, 1940. His subject was "America Declares Peace." This meeting was held during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact.

16. According to the *Daily Worker* of October 7, 1942, page 7, Mr. Trumbo was a sponsor of the Artists' Front to Win the War. The Artists' Front to Win the War was an organization which supported the then current Communist demand for a second front. Many of its sponsors were writers for the Communist press who had opposed the war during the Stalin-Hitler pact, such as Alvah Bessie, Angelo Herndon, Alfred Kreymborg, Albert Maltz, and Ruth McKenney. On September 14, 1942, a meeting was held by the so-called Citizens for Victory Committee at the Philharmonic Auditorium in Los Angeles. Mr. Trumbo was the author of a six-page article entitled "An Open Letter to American People," which was distributed at this meeting, urging the readers to petition and wire the President for the opening of a second front.

17. Another Communist promoted enterprise was the so-called Council for Civic Unity. The *People's World*, official west coast Communist organ for April 28, 1944, mentioned that Dalton Trumbo made a collection speech for this organization which netted \$3,000. A similar group, known as the Academic and Civil Rights Council, mentions Dalton Trumbo as a speaker in the *People's World* of January 2, 1941. Affiliated with the Council for Civic Unity were the following Communist groups: American Youth for Democracy, formerly known as the Young Communist League; Morning Freiheit Association, supporting the Morning Freiheit, Yiddish organ of the Communist Party; the International Workers Order and other organizations.

18. Paul Robeson, who has a long record of Communist affiliations, was the moving spirit in what was known as American Crusade to End Lynching which organized a pilgrimage to Washington, D. C., for September 23, 1946. This venture was actively supported by the Communist press. Mr. Trumbo was a signer of the call for this pilgrimage, which was another example of Communist efforts to organize mass marches and mass demonstrations on capital cities.

19. According to the *People's World* of January 15, 1941, page 5, Mr. Trumbo was listed as a speaker at a banquet sponsored by the North California Civil Rights Council held at the Whiteomb Hotel in San Francisco on January 18, 1941. This meeting was primarily concerned with efforts to defend the Communist Party and Communist cases. Mr. Trumbo also took part in a series of meetings held about May 10, 1942, for the purpose of launching a committee to free Earl Browder.

20. According to the program of a members meeting of the Hollywood Arts, Sciences, and Professional Council of September 17, 1947, Mr. Trumbo was listed as a speaker. The Hollywood Arts, Sciences, and Professional Council is a branch of the Progressive Citizens of America which was formed by the left wing group of the ICCASP after the latter organization was dissolved when its Communist denominations could no longer be concealed.

21. The *Daily People's World*, official Communist Party publication on the west coast, dated May 2, 1947, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the sponsors of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Civil Rights Congress.

22. The *Worker*, official publication of the Communist Party dated September 22, 1946, published a picture of the editor and editorial board of a new magazine entitled "Mainstream," which was referred to as a "Marxist literary magazine." Dalton Trumbo, whose picture appeared with this article, was stated to be a member of the board of directors.

23. A circular announcing a "People's Rally for Peace" meeting at the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles on April 24, 1941, under the auspices of the American Peace Mobilization listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the speakers. The purpose of this meeting, according to the circular, was to urge the defeat of the House of Representatives bill for lease-lend.

The *Daily People's World*, a Communist newspaper for the west coast, dated July 15, 1941, states that Trumbo was in attendance at a meeting of the American Peace Mobilization held at the Hollywood Town Forum, Hollywood, Calif., on May 17, 1941.

24. The *Daily Worker*, dated June 20, 1941, listed Trumbo as a speaker at a Free Speech Rally sponsored by the Southern California Branch of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties held at the Embassy Auditorium in Los Angeles, June 18, 1941.

25. The *Clipper*, official magazine of the League of American Writers, described above, for the month of August 1941, stated that Dalton Trumbo had been a contributor for the past 12 issues of this magazine.

A circular advertising the School for Writers sponsored by the Hollywood Chapter of the League of American Writers for the 1941-42 term mentioned Dalton Trumbo as a lecturer.

The Daily People's World, dated March 31, 1943, in an article entitled "Young Writers Develop Technique in Workshop," stated that Dalton Trumbo participated in the writers conference held during December 1942, under the slogan "The Pen Is a Sword," in which beginners, veteran screen writers, novelists, poets, and writers in every medium discussed just how each writer could make his pen a weapon for democracy. The article further stated that the conference was called by the Writers Workshop, which was sponsored by the League of American Writers.

The Screen Writer, the official publication of the Screen Writers Guild, for the month of June 1946, published an edited transcript of an informal discussion held under the auspices of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization between the noted Russian writer Konstantin Simonov and members of the Screen Writers Guild. The forum was presided over by Dalton Trumbo.

26. The California Eagle, dated March 7, 1946, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the sponsors of the American Youth for Democracy, formerly the Young Communist League, dance held in Los Angeles on March 4, 1946, for the benefit of the United Electrical Workers who were on strike. This is a Communist-controlled union.

A pamphlet advertising the "Salute to Young America" program under the auspices of the American Youth for Democracy to be held at the Hotel Hollywood, Hollywood, Calif., on December 1, 1944, listed Dalton Trumbo as a member of the sponsoring committee and Mrs. Trumbo as secretary of the committee.

The Daily People's World for December 5, 1944, stated that Trumbo was a speaker at the above meeting.

A pamphlet advertising the "Youth Conference" under sponsorship of the American Youth for Democracy, scheduled for October 21, 1945, at the Los Angeles City College, listed Dalton Trumbo as a sponsor.

A printed advertisement announcing a "Welcome Home, Joe" dinner sponsored by the Los Angeles County American Youth for Democracy, scheduled to be held December 16, 1945, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the dinner committee members. This meeting was advertised to be held at the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles, Calif.

27. The Daily Worker, dated October 19, 1942, listed Dalton Trumbo as a sponsor of a dinner under the auspices of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to be held at the Astor Hotel, New York City, on October 27, 1942. This organization has been described above.

A pamphlet issued by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, dated October 21, 1944, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the national sponsors of this organization.

Letterheads of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, 192 Lexington Avenue, New York City, obtained for the years 1945 and 1946, also listed Dalton Trumbo as a national sponsor of this organization.

28. The Daily Worker, dated September 16, 1944, in an article entitled "Film Front," lists Dalton Trumbo as being affiliated with the Hollywood Democratic Committee. This organization has been described above.

29. The Daily Worker, dated November 22, 1944, stated that Dalton Trumbo was elected to the board of directors of the Screen Writers Guild.

The Screen Writer, official publication of the Screen Writers Guild, in the 1946 issues reflected that Dalton Trumbo was the editor of the Screen Writer.

A proposal appeared in the Screen Writer, edited by Dalton Trumbo, July issue, 1946, for an American Authors Authority. According to this report, the authority is to be a marketing monopoly which will copyright and lease to users all writings by American authors. It is to begin with scripts for screen and radio and articles for magazines. By controlling this lucrative field, the authority will be the exclusive agent for America's most successful writers.

30. A letterhead for the People's Educational Center, dated January 11, 1945, announced the second annual meeting of the People's Educational Center, a Communist school at the Shoreham Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., on January 21, 1945. The announcement listed Dalton Trumbo as a speaker during the evening session on the subject, Role of the Motion Picture in Shaping the Future.

Page 33 of the report of the California State Legislature's Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, dated 1947, classifies the People's Educational Center as a Communist front.

31. The Daily People's World, dated July 22, 1946, published a photograph of Dalton Trumbo along with an article stating that Trumbo would be "an inaugural

guest speaker Saturday evening, August 10, 1946, at the California Labor School Summer Term for White Collar and Professional Workers on the Monterey Peninsula." The article further stated that reservations would be accepted at the California Labor School, 216 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Page 101 of the report of the California State Legislature's Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, dated 1947, lists the California Labor School as a Communist school.

32. The Daily Variety, a Hollywood trade magazine, for the month of June 1945, listed Dalton Trumbo as a member of the executive council of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. This organization has been described above.

33. The Daily People's World, official Communist Party publication on the west coast, dated May 2, 1947, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the sponsors of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Civil Rights Congress.

The Civil Rights Congress has been engaged in defending Gerhart Eisler, Comintern agent, and Eugene Dennis, executive secretary of the Communist Party.

34. The Daily People's World, dated March 20, 1946, stated that Dalton Trumbo was a speaker at a meeting held at the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles, Calif., under the auspices of the Mobilization for Democracy.

The Daily People's World, dated April 5, 1946, in an article entitled "We Are With—Trumbo Pledges Every Effort on Fight of Native Fascists," comments on a speech by Dalton Trumbo delivered at a meeting of the Mobilization for Democracy held previously in Los Angeles in which Trumbo is reported to have outlined several undertakings by the United States Government, such as Expedition Muskox, Bikini, and the policies of MacArthur in Japan, all of which Trumbo interpreted as an indication of United States imperialism and the work of Fascist reaction in the United States.

35. The California Sentinel, dated May 8, 1947, published a list purported to be the official list of the officers and board of directors of the Southern California Progressive Citizens of America. Dalton Trumbo was listed as a member of the board of directors.

Page 236 of the report of the California State Legislature's Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, dated 1947, refers to the Los Angeles Chapter of the Progressive Citizens of America as a consolidation of the National Political Action Committee and the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which are referred to as Communist fronts.

36. The Daily People's World, dated October 19, 1942, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of 400 prominent people who signed an open letter to President Roosevelt urging the United States to sever diplomatic relations with Spain. This letter was made public, according to the article, by the Council for Pan-American Democracy, which has attacked alleged American imperialism.

37. The Daily People's World, dated November 6, 1945, carried an advertisement under the heading, "Break relations with Spain," advising that a meeting was scheduled for the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles, Calif., for November 16, 1945, at which Dalton Trumbo would serve as chairman. The meeting was said to be under the auspices of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom. This was part of the Communist campaign in behalf of Loyalist Spain initiated at the seventh Congress of the Communist International—the summer of 1935.

38. The Daily Worker, dated May 24, 1947, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the speakers at the Artists Fight Back meeting sponsored by Mainstream, to be held at Manhattan Center, New York City, on June 11, 1947. The article stated that the rally would give the answer of the writers and artists to the "Un-American Committee's" attacks on democratic culture in America.

The New York World Telegram, dated June 11, 1947, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the speakers at the Artists Fight Back rally held at Manhattan Center, New York City, on June 11, 1947.

The Worker, dated March 23, 1947, published a write-up on the magazine Mainstream showing the table of contents for the winter edition, 1946, listing Dalton Trumbo as a contributor with a poem entitled "Confessional." This magazine has been described above.

39. The Daily People's World, dated October 24, 1942, listed Dalton Trumbo as one of the persons who endorsed LaRue McCormick as Communist Party candidate for State senator of Los Angeles County.

The Daily People's World, dated July 6, 1944, announced that Dalton Trumbo would be one of the judges of a short-story contest sponsored by the Daily People's World to run from August 1, 1944, to February 1, 1945.

The Daily People's World, dated March 26, 1946, listed Dalton Trumbo as a speaker at a forum held at the Embassy Auditorium on April 8, 1946, under the auspices of the Daily People's World entitled "Art—Weapon of the People." A photostatic copy of this publicity is attached.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like to call Investigator Louis J. Russell.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Russell has previously been sworn in this hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will swear him now, just to make sure.

Mr. Russell, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. State your full name, Mr. Russell.

Mr. RUSSELL. Louis J. Russell.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are a member of the investigating staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were with the Federal Bureau of Investigation as an agent for 10 years?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you designated to make an investigation to determine whether or not Dalton Trumbo was a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give the committee the results of your investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

During the course of the investigation I secured information regarding the Communist Party registration card of Dalton Trumbo for the year 1944. I have a photostatic copy of this registration card before me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Read it to the committee; that is, read for the benefit of the committee the information contained thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. This card bears the name "Dalt T." At the time this card was obtained, I also obtained a code which reflects the name "Dalt T" was the name used for Dalton Trumbo on the Communist Party registration card. This card reflects that "Dalt T" resided at 620 Beverly Drive, city Beverly Hills, county Los Angeles, State of California. The card bears the number 47187. It contains a notation "1944 card No. 37300." It contains another quotation which states "New card issued November 30, 1944." The balance of the card contains descriptive data regarding "Dalt T." It states that "Dalt T" is a male. Occupation that of a writer. Industry, motion picture. The question is then asked: "A member of the CIO, A. F. of L., inde-

pendent union, or no union?" Independent union is checked. The last question is: "Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker?" The answer "Yes" is checked.⁵⁴

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail, do you have any questions?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. The evidence presented before this committee concerning Dalton Trumbo clearly indicates that he is an active Communist Party member. Also the fact that he followed the usual Communist line of not responding to questions of the committee is definite proof that he is a member of the Communist Party. Therefore, by unanimous vote of the members present, the subcommittee recommends to the full committee that Dalton Trumbo be cited for contempt of Congress, and that for his refusal to answer the pertinent question, "Are you a member of the Communist Party?" and his refusal to answer other questions, the committee recommends appropriate action be taken by the full committee without delay.

Mr. Stripling, next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Roy Brewer.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Roy Brewer, take the stand, please.

(Mr. Roy M. Brewer, accompanied by counsel, takes place at witness table.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brewer, will you please stand and raise your right hand.

Mr. Brewer, do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BREWER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF ROY M. BREWER

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brewer, will you state your full name, please, and present address?

Mr. BREWER. Roy M. Brewer, 716 North Curson Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Brewer?

Mr. BREWER. In Hall County, Nebr., August 9, 1909.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are the international representative of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Motion-Picture Machine Operators of the United States?

Mr. BREWER. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. I have a brief preliminary statement which I would like to read, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. May we see the statement, to see if it is pertinent?

Mr. BREWER. Yes [handing statement to the chairman].

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brewer, we think that everything in this statement can be substantiated through questioning. Therefore, we would suggest that at this stage the chief investigator ask questions.

Mr. BREWER. That is quite all right.

⁵⁴ See appendix, p. 539, for exhibit 67.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you can answer in accordance with the statement. If later on the committee decides to place it in the record, why, when we come to that we will accept it.

Mr. BREWER. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brewer, you stated you are the international representative of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States?

Mr. BREWER. Of the United States and Canada; yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you held that position?

Mr. BREWER. Since January 1, 1945.

Mr. STRIPLING. What did you do prior to that?

Mr. BREWER. Immediately prior to that I was employed by the War Production Board as the Chief of the Plant and Community Facilities Service of the Office of Labor Production, here in Washington. Prior to that time I had been president of the Nebraska State Federation of Labor, which is the State branch of the American Federation of Labor, a position which I had held for 8 years.

Mr. STRIPLING. How large is your union?

Mr. BREWER. The International Alliance is approximately 65,000 members.

Mr. STRIPLING. How many of your members are employed in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. BREWER. Practically all in the motion-picture industry, but approximately 15,000 in Hollywood.

Mr. STRIPLING. Fifteen thousand in Hollywood?

Mr. BREWER. Correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you give the committee a brief break-down as to the type of jobs which your members hold throughout the industry?

Mr. BREWER. You mean throughout the entire industry or in Hollywood?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes; in other words, what type of work do your members do?

Mr. BREWER. Well, so far as our membership throughout the Nation is concerned, it is primarily confined to the work of motion-picture projectionists, motion-picture stage employees, employees in the film and distribution exchanges of the various film companies and—that is the basis of them throughout the Nation.

In Hollywood, we have most of the technical employees employed in the making of motion pictures. We have the cameramen, the sound men, and those employees who do work comparable to stage employees in the studios, such as grips, property men, and so forth. We have 14 unions in Hollywood, which represent, as I have stated, approximately one-half of the employees in the studios. There are about, I think, 7,000 so-called mechanical employees, with the others of the 15,000 being represented by actors and by extras.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Brewer, you said "grips." What is a "grip?"

Mr. BREWER. Well, a "grip" is a man that handles the scenery on the set.

Mr. McDOWELL. A scene shifter?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. That is a term that has gotten to be applied to those men who move the scenery and the various objects on the set, in

the actual making of a picture or in the actual setting of a set on the stage.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Brewer, how long have you been in Hollywood?

MR. BREWER. I arrived in Hollywood on March 12, 1945. I had previously made one trip there, which was in late December of 1944.

MR. STRIPLING. Since you have been there, have you observed any Communist influence or infiltration among the employees of the motion-picture industry, in any field?

MR. BREWER. Yes, sir; I have—a great deal.

MR. STRIPLING. Would you describe to the committee the extent of such infiltration which you have observed yourself?

THE CHAIRMAN. And, Mr. Brewer, will you speak louder, please?

MR. BREWER. Yes. Well, that is quite a long story. When I arrived in Hollywood, on March 12, 1945, there was in progress a jurisdictional strike—

MR. STRIPLING. May I interrupt you at this point, Mr. Brewer?

MR. CHAIRMAN. I failed to have the witness identify the gentleman with him. Is he your counsel?

MR. BREWER. He is.

MR. STRIPLING. Would you identify him?

MR. BREWER. Mr. Matthew Levy.

MR. STRIPLING. Proceed, Mr. Brewer.

MR. BREWER. When I arrived in Hollywood, on March 12, 1945, there was a jurisdictional strike in progress which had been called by the Conference of Studio Unions. That was an organization of certain American Federation of Labor unions that had been banded together to form sort of an unofficial association of A. F. of L. unions. It was comprised primarily of members of the painters union, but it also had in its membership a union of the International Association of Machinists, a union of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, a union of the Building Service Employees International Union, an organization of the plumbers' union, and there was a sort of unofficial association with respect to molders and sheet-metal workers who were employed in the studios in very small numbers.

Presumably, the issue over which this strike had been called was the jurisdiction over a group of employees known as set dressers. These are employees who have the responsibility for the dressing of the motion picture sets prior to the shooting.

MR. STRIPLING. Now, in connection with this jurisdictional strike, Mr. Brewer, has there been any threat on the part of the Communists at any time to take over your union?

MR. BREWER. Well, as a matter of fact, Mr. Stripling, as the situation developed and as we became involved with the various forces at work behind this strike, it became very evident to me that there was something very seriously wrong. It took me a little while to identify it, but I finally identified it to my perfect satisfaction as a definite attempt on the part of the Communist Party to take over the entire structure of the trade-union movement in the studios.

MR. STRIPLING. Throughout the industry?

MR. BREWER. The entire motion-picture industry in Hollywood.

MR. STRIPLING. Now, who was responsible for that effort and who was in charge of it?

MR. BREWER. Well, the leader of the strike and the president of the Conference of Studio Unions and the person that was really directing

most of the affairs openly was a man by the name of Herbert K. Sorrell, who was officially the business agent of the painters' union, local No. 644, in the studios.

Mr. STRIPLING. Has their effort, on the part of the Communists, to take over your union, been successful?

Mr. BREWER. No, it hasn't; but it has been successful in creating a great deal of strife and turmoil.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is the present status of the situation regarding Communists?

Mr. BREWER. Well, the situation as it exists now is that the Conference of Studio Unions has called a series of four strikes since 1944. The last one was called on September 26, 1946, and is officially still going on, although it has been dissipated and economically is at the present time completely ineffective.

Mr. STRIPLING. You mentioned Herbert K. Sorrell. I believe that there has been testimony before this committee that Herbert K. Sorrell was a Communist. Do you have any information as to the Communist activities of Mr. Sorrell?

Mr. BREWER. I do, Mr. Stripling. And I would like to present this to the committee, if you will permit me to do so.

I would like to say, as a preliminary to this, that when this strike started, the first strike, in 1945, which was the first important strike involved in this question, as it became obvious to me that the strike was being prosecuted by and with the assistance of the Communist forces in the motion-picture studios as well as with those same forces in the entire community, we put out a series of bulletins. I have a complete file of these bulletins, and I will leave them with the committee.

I will not ask that they be introduced as an exhibit, but if the committee finds something in there that they want to use as an exhibit, it will be there for them.

As the result of the publication of those exhibits, Mr. Sorrell filed a suit against me and the international president of my organization for libel.

As a result of that, we started to investigate the situation and we found in possession of an investigator some information with respect to the Communist Party membership of Mr. Herbert K. Sorrell.

Mr. STRIPLING. May I see those, please?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. [Handing documents to Mr. Stripling.]

Mr. STRIPLING. I have here, Mr. Chairman, a photostatic copy of a card, which says:⁵⁵

Control card, first-half of 1937, book No. 74282—

the name "Herbert Stewart"—S-t-e-w-a-r-t—

State of California, County of Los Angeles, city of Los Angeles, district 13. Section, Industrial. Unit, Studios. Occupation, Painter. Union, Painters 644. Male. Age, 41. White.

Now, can you tell us whether or not this photostatic copy, or this document, has ever been introduced before any Government agency in the State of California?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. These documents were presented to the Joint Fact-Finding Committee of the California State Legislature.

⁵⁵ See appendix, p. 525, for exhibit 28.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not Mr. Sorrell has ever made any denial or reply regarding this alleged membership in the Communist Party?

MR. BREWER. Well, I think he has made a general denial. But he was subpoenaed to appear before the committee to answer the allegations as contained by those documents, and he failed to appear in answer to the subpoena.

At the time those were introduced by the California State Committee, there was also introduced evidence by what is considered to be the foremost handwriting expert in America. His name is Mr. Clark Sellers. He is the man that identified the kidnaping note in the Lindbergh kidnaping case as being the writing of Bruno Hauptmann. He is also the man that recently testified in the Overell murder case, identifying the signature on the dynamite receipts as the writing of Bud Gollum. He testified that the signature on this Communist Party membership book receipt was the writing of Herbert K. Sorrell.

MR. STRIPLING. Now, I would like to state, Mr. Chairman, that these same documents were submitted in evidence by a previous witness, Mr. Adolphe Menjou, last week, in which he stated that evidence had been submitted to the California committee to the effect that the party record of Herbert K. Sorrell was carried in the name of Herbert Stewart. This is the same document, or a photostatic copy of the same document.

Do you know whether or not Mr. Sorrell's wife's name is Stewart?

MR. BREWER. The report of the joint committee of the California Legislature says that that was his mother's maiden name, that his mother's maiden name was Stewart.

I have additional evidence here, Mr. Chairman, if you would care to have it.

MR. STRIPLING. Yes. Would you explain to the committee, please—

MR. BREWER. I also have a bulletin which was issued by our organization which outlines in some detail the Communist activities, some of the Communist activities in which Mr. Sorrell has engaged since the year 1938. I will run through them briefly, if it is the wish of the committee that I do so.

THE CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

MR. BREWER. In the testimony this morning there was mention made of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee and the designation of that committee as a Communist front.

In 1940, there was a resolution presented to the Executive Committee of the Motion Picture Democratic Committee by Mr. Philip Dunne and Mr. Melvin Douglas. That committee says, among other things:

The Motion Picture Democratic Committee reaffirms its support of the Roosevelt foreign policy. 2. It commends the President for his condemnation of Russian aggression and the request that the Finnish war debt payments be reserved for Finnish use. 3. That the Motion Picture Democratic Committee is in fundamental disagreement with the Communist Party and other organizations and individuals who supported the President until the Russian aggression and have since turned on the Administration with attacks.

That resolution was rejected by the executive board by a vote of 19 to nothing. Mr. Herbert K. Sorrell at that time was listed as a member of that committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brewer, I notice from the statement that you filed with the chairman you say:

The plan as we see it was for Communist forces led by Mr. Jeff Kibre, Communist agent sent to Hollywood in 1935, and his successor, Herbert K. Sorrell, to infiltrate and control Hollywood technical labor, while other Communist forces led by Mr. John Howard Lawson, whose activities have been effectively described here, to infiltrate and control the talent guilds and so-called cultural groups in the industry.

Who is Jeff Kibre?

Mr. BREWER. That is Jeff Kibre.

Mr. STRIPLING. Kibre.

Mr. BREWER. I would like to say—I have some important testimony with respect to the activities of Jeff Kibre which I would like to put in. I would like to say, however, that I have a great deal more material on the Communist activities of Mr. Sorrell, which—

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, since your statement stated, "Led by Mr. Jeff Kibre, Communist agent sent to Hollywood in 1935," and then you say "and his successor, Herbert K. Sorrell," suppose we deal with Mr. Kibre, before going to Mr. Sorrell, before going any further with Mr. Sorrell.

Mr. BREWER. Fine. As I stated, when I arrived in Hollywood it became necessary for me to find out what we were fighting in this jurisdictional dispute. It became very evident to me that it was not an ordinary trade-union argument. Presumably I was supposed to be fighting a jurisdictional fight with the painters union.

One of the things which convinced me that this was not an ordinary dispute was the experience which I encountered in the Central Labor Council of the city of Los Angeles. Normally, when a union is in a jurisdictional dispute with another international union there is a bond of loyalty that extends down the line of that international union. When I went down to the central labor council I found that the president of that council was a member of the painters union. So I naturally assumed that his sympathies would be with the painters in this jurisdictional dispute. I found, however, that on the executive board of the Central Labor Council was a representative of one of my own unions, who was Mr. Morville Kretcher, the business agent of our film technicians' local No. 683.

Well, the very first issue that came before that council there that had to do with the Hollywood dispute, to my surprise I found out that the painter was on my side and my own representative was on the side of the Conference of Studio Unions. That, among other things, established the fact that the line of loyalty in this dispute and the line of loyalty in the entire union structure in Hollywood were not those lines which follow ordinary trade union structure.

So, I began to investigate, and I found that in every one of our unions we had certain disloyal groups. I came to identify those groups of Communist factions. One of the most important pieces of evidence which I found was that which was contained in the 1940 proceeding of our own international alliance convention, which dealt with the activities of Mr. Kibre. I found printed there a series of reports which had been published in 1939, in the Los Angeles Citizen, and which had been later published in our 1940 proceedings, in 1940. These reports were the reports of Mr. Jeff Kibre to offers of the CIO and also to Communist Party functionaries who have been identified previously in this hearing.

I have picked out a few of the pertinent excerpts which I think are valuable, not only to identify Mr. Kibre as a functionary of the Communist Party, but also to outline the techniques which he had written down and submitted to his superiors in that party.

And with your permission I would like to read these pertinent excerpts, which I think you will find very valuable in analyzing the Communist infiltration in Hollywood.

The CHAIRMAN. How long are they?

Mr. BREWER. Well, I will try to shorten them, Mr. Chairman. I will only read paragraphs that are pertinent. I would say that totally there are probably three or four of these pages.

The CHAIRMAN. The reason I ask that question—we are probably 2 days behind in our schedule, and we want to try to hurry along as best we can, but at the same time include all the evidence that we possibly can. So, without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BREWER. Well, if you feel it is not pertinent, why, you can tell me.

This was a report written by Mr. Kibre to the State headquarters of the CIO on April 23, 1938.

I might say, preliminarily, that there is evidence in the files of the committee in California that there was a definite link between Mr. Kibre and the Soviet Union. There is evidence in the file to show that in the year 1934 there was a meeting held in the city of Carmel, Calif., which was attended by a woman by the name of Ella Winters, and that she was in turn delegated the responsibility of contacting Mr. Kibre, and that according to this evidence she did contact Mr. Kibre.

Now, the representative of the Soviet Union that was at this meeting in Carmel was a Mr. Michael Aisenstein—and I think it is spelled A-i-s-e-n-s-t-e-i-n.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was his connection with the Soviet Union?

Mr. BREWER. He was a representative of the AMTORG Corp., which was the then Russian purchasing agent in this country.

The plans which were laid at this Carmel meeting were later reflected directly in the activities of Mr. Kibre when he appeared in our unions in 1935.

In 1938, Mr. Kibre, now a trusted member of our organization and an employee of the studios in Hollywood, wrote this report to the headquarters of the CIO in California:

REVIEW OF PLAN AND OBJECTIVES FOR THE PAST SEVERAL MONTHS

Developments in Hollywood during the past 2 months have clearly demonstrated that not only the correctness of the analysis of the general situation as presented in the last report but also the concrete possibilities of a movement of unity within the present craft set-up.

A studio unemployment conference representing 12 unions and guilds is the most basic achievement. This conference has already practically reached the point of demanding joint action by all of the unions and guilds.

Meanwhile, a broad anti-IATSE movement—

and I might say "IATSE" is the designation for my unions, the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees—

representing a majority of workers in the industry has announced support of the program of unemployment conference as the best means of fighting the company-union policies of the IA and the employers.

By bringing these two movements together on a fundamental issue of better conditions, a solid though not a spectacular movement for a federation as the preliminary step for industrial unionism has developed.

Now, later on in the report Mr. Kibre makes what I feel to be a very significant statement. He says that the Screen Cartoonists Guild, which has figured very importantly in the activities in Hollywood and which is the union about which Mr. Disney testified—he says positively that this guild was organized by us. Later on he says:

The building of the unemployment conferences of the various related activities would have been impossible without the further development and coordination of rank-and-file machinery embracing the entire industry. Influential groups have been established in every major union and guild. These groups are coordinated by a regular underground apparatus. It is through these groups, based in the present organizations, committed to the object of an industrial union for the 35,000 workers in the industry, that the present field representative is working.

Then, in closing this report, Mr. Kibre says further:

The establishment of an industrial union in Hollywood will have repercussions far beyond the industry itself. It will open up virtually the untouched field of the amusement industry as a whole.

And I would like to say in connection with that that the amusement industry is a well-organized industry and therefore when he says, "the untouched field," he must have meant the field untouched by communism, because it was a well-organized field at that time.

Moreover, it will have tremendous influence on the entire development of the CIO in Los Angeles County.

And I want to say here that the official CIO movement in Los Angeles, as well as in the State of California, is recognized by all experts in the field of labor as being completely under the domination of the Communist Party. It is led by a man by the name of Phil Connolly, who is generally recognized as being a Communist.

As the largest compact industry in the county, it will be of inestimable value in giving the industrial movement a solid base, and with Hollywood and its prestige linked to the harbor and the longshoremen, a tremendous spurt would be given the organizing movement as a whole.

And there is a significant note. It is signed.

Respectfully submitted:

JEFF KIBRE,
Field Representative for Hollywood.

And it has a significant note at the bottom, which says:

It is of extreme importance because of the nature of the work being carried on that the report and the name of the representative be kept as confidential as possible.

Now, the next report which we have is a very significant one because it was written to Mr. Bob Reed, who has been identified here as a Communist Party functionary attached to the fraction in the Actors Equity in New York City.

Mr. McDOWELL. What was his name, again?

Mr. BREWER. Bob Reed, and he was identified by Mr. Rushmore in his testimony as a Communist Party functionary. Mr. Kibre starts out this report by this statement:

MY DEAR BOB: Well, one thing about Reds. They seldom write except on business. A number of things are on my mind, but first it appears that the long-awaited showdown in the industry between the IA and real unity is fast on its way and that's the main business of this note.

Also, I am the undercover field representative for the CIO in Hollywood, because of economy. Reedy Cowl had to go back to the Painters.

Then I will skip part of it here, which is not too significant, and pick it up where he says:

In the meantime, I wish you would discuss the matter of IA action with Jack Stachel. Necessity of my getting in touch with the contacts in various cities, and so forth.

I have taken it up with Paul Cline——

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you identify Jack Stachel? Mr. Brewer, do you know Jack Stachel?

Mr. BREWER. I am sorry. I know that he is a recognized party functionary, but I personally cannot identify him.

Paul Cline——

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Will you for the record identify Jack Stachel?

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to put a memorandum in on Jack Stachel, which I will have here in a few moments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWER (reading):

I have taken it up with Paul Cline, but he feels personal appeal by you or V. J.——

Now, the persons who analyzed these reports identified "V. J." as V. J. Jerome, who was also identified by Mr. Rushmore in his testimony.

rather than communicate through official channels would get quicker results. I know definitely that a Morris Iushewitz, publicity director——

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you spell that, please?

Mr. BREWER. It is M-o-r-r-i-s I-u-s-h-e-w-i-t-z.

publicity director of the motion-picture operators' local of New York, is one of our people. Also I understand we have a person in the Cleveland local who pulls considerable weight. It is imperative that I get hold of all of these contacts. Send them report on the role of the IA in Hollywood.

Then Mr. Kibre winds up this in a very friendly way, which would indicate a close personal relationship with Mr. Bob Reed. He says:

Hope all of this isn't too big an order for a jolt out of the blue sky, and hope Ida is as sunny-faced as ever. Maybe I'll be seeing you in a couple of weeks. Hope so. By the way, if Fred Keating is around, give him my regards.

Comradely,

JEFF.

Now, as you analyze these reports, it becomes significant that what Mr. Kibre was trying to do——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brewer, I wish you would identify for the committee the documents from which you have been reading.

Mr. BREWER. This is a copy of the Proceedings of the 1940 Convention of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of the United States and Canada, the official report.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. Now, Mr. Kibre's report was placed in the official report by Mr. Kibre?

Mr. BREWER. No. This was placed in the report of the convention by the office of our international union. These reports——

Mr. STRIPLING. In other words, it was as a disclosure of the activity of Mr. Kibre?

Mr. BREWER. That is right. And these reports were previously published in the Los Angeles Citizen, which is the official publication

of the Los Angeles Central Labor Council in Los Angeles, at the time of an election.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, had Mr. Kibre ever denied the content of these reports?

Mr. BREWER. Not to my knowledge. And, significantly enough, when these reports were made public and the election which Mr. Kibre subsequently engineered in this effort to take over the Hollywood unions, he disappeared from the picture in Hollywood. His next appearance on the scene was as a leader in the North American Aviation strike, in Englewood, Calif., which was identified by President Roosevelt as a political strike, called for the purpose of impeding the defense of the country. He is now an official of the CIO fishermen's union and has been indicted and convicted of a charge dealing with violation of the Federal antitrust laws.

The significance of the technique which is outlined in Mr. Kibre's early reports, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, is that that technique has been followed since that time in the organization and the activities of the Conference of Studio Unions.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, how many members does the Conference of Studio Unions have in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. BREWER. Well, right now that is a little indefinite, but at the time the strike was called they had about 9,000.

Mr. STRIPLING. Nine thousand?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. As compared with—

Mr. BREWER. With 15,000 in our organization, and a total of approximately 30,000, including actors and extras.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, I would like to get this straight, Mr. Brewer: How many jurisdictional strikes have there been in the motion-picture industry in the past 10 years that you can recall? Was there one in 1944?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; there was a brief strike called by Mr. Sorrell.

Mr. STRIPLING. In '45 was there one?

Mr. BREWER. There was a strike called on March 12, 1945, which lasted for about 8 months.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was there one in 1946? A new one?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. There were two strikes in 1946. There was a 2-day strike called on July 2, 1946, and there was a second strike called on September 26, 1946, which has not as yet officially ended.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, as a labor official, can you tell the committee whether or not the Communists were instrumental in fomenting any of these strikes which you have labeled jurisdictional strikes? What part did the Communists play in them? So far as this committee is concerned, it is my understanding that their only interest would be whether or not the Communists have exercised any influence in labor relations or labor matters within Hollywood. They are not concerned with jurisdictional strikes as such.

Mr. BREWER. Well, analyzing what has happened in the past and analyzing the tactics, the techniques, and the activities of individuals in the present and immediate past situations, one can only conclude that the fundamental purpose of the Conference of Studio Unions was to drive a wedge between the members of the union in Hollywood and the official branches of their organizations.

All of the unions which were in the—I won't say all, but most of the unions which formed the core of the unemployment conference, which Jeff Kibre was describing back in 1939, also formed the core of the Conference of Studio Unions. It is our firm conviction and belief that the Conference of Studio Unions was organized for that purpose, and that the jurisdictional strikes which have since taken place were all a part of the efforts of the Communist Party to disrupt and destroy the American Federation of Labor, in the unions in the studios, and to throw them into an industry-wide industrial union which would be under Communist control.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, in the Conference of Studio Unions, what percentage of the rank-and-file membership would you say are Communists or under the bidding or carrying out the bidding of Communists within the studio unions?

Mr. BREWER. Well, that is a very difficult question to answer because the indoctrination processes of those unions that were brought into the Communist orbit were very efficient. One of the very important techniques which they developed was to insulate the thinking of these individuals to any ideas except those which their officers put before them.

Mr. STRIPLING. You mentioned the officers. Let me put this question first, then: What percentage of the officials of the Conference of Studio Unions do you feel are Communists? Is the union under Communist domination?

Mr. BREWER. The Conference of Studio Unions has consistently followed the Communist Party line since its origin. Herbert K. Sorrell has religiously followed the Communist Party line, with perhaps one minor exception. There are a number of unions in the Conference of Studio Unions which I consider to be completely under Communist domination.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you name some of those unions?

Mr. BREWER. The first one is the Painters' Union, Local 644, of which Herbert K. Sorrell is the principal officer.

The second one is the Screen Cartoonists Guild, of which a Mr. Maurice Howard is the principal officer.

The third is the Screen Story Analysts Guild, which, incidentally, is a part of the Painters' Union, of which Mr. Matty Madison and Miss Frances Millington are the principal officers.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Brewer, did you say that the Screen Story Analysts Guild was a part of the painters' union?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well—

Mr. BREWER. Actually—excuse me.

Mr. McDOWELL. Just what would be the connection between analyzing the scripts and doing some painting?

Mr. BREWER. That is only a part of the very peculiar things that happened in Hollywood labor. As a matter of fact—and again trying to analyze the problem from a fundamental standpoint—it became evident to us that the painters' union was being used by this Communist core as an instrument of setting up within this trade-union structure a second industrial union. They took over not only the Screen Story Analysts, but the painters' union organized and issued charters to the Screen Cartoonists Guild, to the Screen Publicists

Guild—now, those are press agents; those are the men who are the press agents. Most of them are past newspapermen, but they organized those men, and women, and put them in the painters' union.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, they could possibly be in the painters' union. But your idea here—you are pointing out that this painters' union was attempting to suck in everything, every other union, into itself, for more complete control; is that it?

Mr. BREWER. Well, that was a part of their program. The first thing that they were trying to do was to bring into the Conference of Studio Unions all those unions that they could bring around to the Communist Party philosophy.

Then, those groups that were unorganized in the studios at the time this campaign started, in order to give them an international union in the American Federation of Labor which they could control, they put into the painters' union.

Now, another very large union which they organized into the painters' union was the office employees. Those are stenographers, clerks, file clerks, and messengers. All those people were organized and put in the painters' union, and then subsequently brought in and made a part of the Conference of Studio Unions, to broaden the wedge which they were driving in the labor structure in Hollywood.

There is one other union which is significant and important that they organized, and that was what is called the Set Designers. Now, that was a miscellaneous group of art department employees. They included the set designers, the illustrators, the sketch artists, and also the set decorators which they attempted to organize and eventually did organize into the painters' union.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brewer, getting back to my question concerning the percentage of officials of the Conference of Studio Unions who you consider to be Communists.

Mr. BREWER. Well, I considered, as I say, that the entire Conference of Studio Unions was under Communist domination.

Now, there were some of the unions which followed along with them for the most part. I would say that the machinists' union was not so completely under their domination as were the others, but they supported most of the Communist Party programs.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now——

Mr. BREWER. So——

Mr. STRIPLING. Pardon me.

Mr. BREWER. So the Conference of Studio Unions and all of those unions that were a part of the conference and that were under their influence were for all practical purposes a part of the Communist spearhead in the studios.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, in connection with these jurisdictional strikes which you said the Communists figured in, was there any violence or was there evidence of any of the typical tactics of the Communists?

Mr. BREWER. Yes. There was some of the most unbelievable amounts of violence that have ever appeared on the scene in the American labor movement.

I have here a list of our members that were injured in this 1946 strike.

You see, what had happened was that in 1945 the Conference of Studio Unions for all practical purposes had lost the strike. They

had to close the studios down in order to make their strike effective. And recognizing that the purpose of closing the studios down was to destroy our union, it naturally became paramount to our interests that they not succeed in that endeavor. So we announced at the time that if they persisted in prosecuting a jurisdictional strike against our unions in an effort to wrest from our union jurisdiction which had been traditionally ours in the studios, we would resist it.

So, for all practical purposes, by the 1st of October that strike had been lost. Efforts and conferences had been made for settlement, but without success.

On October 5, there appeared at Warner Bros. studio mass picket lines, which according to the stated intent of their leaders were designed to prevent by physical force anyone from going through into the studios.

As a result of these mass picket lines, a complete state of anarchy was created at Warner Bros. studio. The management of that studio could not get into his own studio. The police department attempted to cope with it, but found themselves completely unable to do so, with the result that pressure was brought to bear on various groups, and eventually that strike was settled.

However, after the strike was settled, an investigation was entered into by another committee of the California Legislature, headed by C. Don Field. They found positive evidence, in an official report, of Communist activities in those picket lines.

As a matter of fact, we didn't need a report of the committee on law and order of the State legislature to tell us, because in the mass picket lines there were a number of prominent people who had been identified with Communist activities. Among them was Mr. John Howard Lawson, who was arrested in those mass picket lines.

Mr. McDOWELL. You mean he was walking the picket line?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; he was. In addition to Mr. John Howard Lawson, there were other persons, who were not involved in the strike so far as the Conference of Studio Unions were concerned, who were there and who said they were observers, but who actually were assisting, in our opinion, in creating the chaos and the anarchy that existed there.

Mr. McDOWELL. They were a part of the film industry?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Mr. McDOWELL. They were——

Mr. BREWER. And I have the names of some of the prominent ones, if you would like to have them.

Mr. McDOWELL. Yes; name some of them.

Mr. BREWER. Mr. John Garfield. Mr. John Wexley, Mr. Sidney Buchman, Mr. Howard Koch, Mr. Larry Adler, Mr. Lewis Milestone, Mr. Dalton Trumbo, Mr. Cary McWilliams, Mr. Frank Tuttle, Mr. Robert Rossen, Mr. William Pomerance, and Mr. John Howard Lawson.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brewer, can you tell us whether or not it was at Warner Bros. studios that the automobiles were overturned?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; automobiles were overturned. Hundreds of men were attacked. Automobiles were smashed. And on certain days they cleaned up tons of broken bottles and bricks and stones that were used in an effort to forcibly prevent members, fellow members of the Ameri-

can Federation of Labor, from going to work and fulfilling their contracts with the studios.

MR. STRIPLING. Well, then, Mr. Brewer, wouldn't the National Labor Relations Board have jurisdiction in a matter of this kind?

MR. BREWER. Well, that I think, perhaps, is a legal question.

MR. STRIPLING. In other words, did any phase of the jurisdictional strikes come within the purview of the National Labor Relations Board?

MR. BREWER. Yes. As a matter of fact, the 1945 strike was called at a time when the National Labor Relations Board was conducting a hearing into the very question about which the strike was presumably called. That was the question of representation of the set decorators in the studios. The hearing had started, on a Monday previously, and the hearing had gone for 1 week. The Conference of Studio Unions had placed their side of the story into the record. The hearing had recessed and was to take up the following Monday, when the IATSE was to have had its opportunity to present its case.

On the Monday morning of March 12, the strike was called.

MR. STRIPLING. Who presided in that hearing of the National Labor Relations Board?

MR. BREWER. At that particular hearing I can't say, Mr. Stripling. I didn't attend them because I was busy with the activities in connection with the strike.

MR. STRIPLING. Well, did the National Labor Relations Board succeed in any way in alleviating the situation directly?

MR. BREWER. Actually, the National Labor Relations Board did eventually hand down a decision and held an election. The election was held and the Conference of Studio Unions won the election by a rather small margin. But that did not end the strike.

MR. STRIPLING. Why didn't it end the strike?

MR. BREWER. Well, by that time all of these other unions were out in support of them. They were making demands. The situation had become so complicated that new issues had entered into it, and the strike continued on for several months after the results of the election were made known.

Now, there is a great deal more that I would like to say about this violence.

The strike in 1945 was settled. But in 1946, on September 26, the mass picket lines were taken up right where they left off at Warner Brothers in 1945. The violence that took place in the 1946 strike was equal in intensity to that which existed in 1945.

We were a little more used to that sort of thing by 1946. I have here—which I will leave with the committee—a complete report of the personal injuries of our members and members of other A. F. of L. unions in the 1946 strike.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brewer—

MR. BREWER. Some 300 in number.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question right here? Would you say definitely that this violence was due to the Communist influence in those unions and the Communist influence on the picket lines?

MR. BREWER. I will say definitely, Mr. Chairman, that had it not been for the Communist activities in the motion-picture studio unions, there would have been no strikes. And the violence—as I said, there

is an official report here which said that much of the violence was the direct result of Communist infiltration.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, from your own opinion, would you say that the violence on the picket lines was due to the Communists on the picket lines?

Mr. BREWER. Much of it; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what do you mean by "much"? Do you mean 25 percent or 75 percent, or—

Mr. BREWER. Well, the picket-line activities were organized and directed by Herbert K. Sorrell—all of them. He was the leader.

The CHAIRMAN. Who, in your opinion, is a Communist?

Mr. BREWER. Who, in my opinion, is a Communist. And in the organization of all of the activities he was assisted by men who, in my opinion, are Communists and are still active in the Hollywood studio situation.

The CHAIRMAN. We will just suspend for a few minutes. Mr. Stripling, come up here, please.

(Hearing suspends.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail, do you have any questions?

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Chairman, I have before me the statement that Mr. Brewer sought to introduce at the beginning of his testimony this morning, and it impresses me as being relevant, comprehensive, and informative and of value to the intent and purpose of this committee. It is my suggestion that the witness be permitted to read that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I have looked over the statement. The statement is pertinent. And Mr. McDowell agrees. You go ahead and read the statement at this time.

Mr. BREWER. In response to your subpoena, I welcome the opportunity to present to this committee the evidence which I have of Communist infiltration into the Hollywood studio unions. I am sure that the 30,000 employees now working in the Hollywood studios, of which our union represents approximately one-half, are fully conscious of the responsibility which the committee has in this matter.

The story of Communist infiltration and intrigue which this committee is revealing to the American people is not new to us. We have been resisting it for more than 10 years. I shall present evidence which I think will conclusively establish the fact that there is, and there has been, a real Communist plot to capture our union in Hollywood, as a part of the Communist plan to control the motion-picture industry as a whole. The plan came dangerously close to success. I am happy to say that thus far it has failed.

The plan, as we see it, was for Communist forces, led by Mr. Jeff Kibre, Communist agent sent to Hollywood in 1935, and his successor, Herbert K. Sorrell, to infiltrate and control Hollywood technical labor, while other Communist forces led by Mr. John Howard Lawson, whose activities have been effectively described here, were to infiltrate and control the talent guilds and so-called cultural groups in the industry. At the appropriate time these two forces were to be joined in one over-all industrial union set-up under complete Communist domination. Our international union, the IATSE, found itself as the one real effective force standing in the way of this program.

Having failed to control our organization in Hollywood, the Communists found it necessary to seek to destroy it. Fomenting and aggravating jurisdictional irritations existing in the trade-union struc-

ture in the studios, the Communists in 1944, 1945, 1946, and 1947 engineered and maintained a running series of jurisdictional strikes against our union. The real purpose of these strikes was the weakening and ultimate destruction of the IATSE, which was the recognized bulwark against Communist seizure of the studio unions.

Had those strikes been successful, and the IATSE been defeated, we are sure that the few remaining forces of resistance would have easily succumbed to the unbelievable effective machine which the Communist movement had built in southern California in 1944. With a Communist-controlled union representing all Hollywood technical labor supporting a Screen Writers Guild, through which only pro-Communist writers could get into the industry, we believe that the screen would have been effectively captured, notwithstanding the good intentions of the producers of motion pictures.

While this Communist plan has been defeated thus far, we have not been successful in this fight without tremendous effort on the part of the real A. F. of L. unions in the studios and a tremendous sacrifice on the part of many of our members. Hollywood workers have fought valiantly to prevent their unions from becoming an adjunct of Soviet foreign policy. Hundreds have suffered personal injuries. Homes have been bombed, automobiles destroyed, and children threatened. Intimidation and coercion have caused many to live for weeks in terror.

Some may say that the Hollywood story is a figment of a motion-picture make-believe; but to our members in the Hollywood unions, it is very real indeed. To them it has meant the pitting of workers against workers, brother against brother; yes—and even husband against wife. Thus have the Communists sought to justify their slogan that the end justifies the means.

The trend of the time has aided our cause. Important persons in the industry who a few years ago greeted our story as too fantastic to believe, are now looking at it with recognition and concern. But we know from experience that the Communists will not give up—the prize is too great. We hope, therefore, that with the help of the committee, the Communist menace in the motion-picture industry may be successfully destroyed, to the end that Hollywood labor may be spared in the future the strife and turmoil of the immediate past.

We shall continue to fight, to expose, and to remove the Communist menace from our trade-unions, so that, in keeping with our American system, our labor organizations may continue to be free, clean, progressive, patriotic, and democratic, with continued improvement of working conditions and maintenance of adequate security for the many thousands of employees in this great American industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Brewer, were you here when Mr. Trumbo testified?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; I was.

Mr. McDOWELL. You observed him when he refused to testify?

Mr. BREWER. Yes; I did.

Mr. McDOWELL. Did you observe his actions when he was asked if he belonged to the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. BREWER. I did.

Mr. McDOWELL. Would it offend you if I, or if any other person, would ask you if you belong to a labor union?

Mr. BREWER. It certainly would not.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, do you know of any other American member of a labor union, of which there are millions and millions in this country, who would be offended or who would conclude that some right was being violated if that were asked?

Mr. BREWER. I see no reason at all why today a man should deny his membership in an American trade-union—none at all.

Mr. McDOWELL. You have become out there in recent years a very vigorous and well-known fighter against communism. It has been almost the 100-percent experience of every person who is opposed to communism, who has come before this committee or in any other way, to have been smeared in some fashion. Has that happened to you?

Mr. BREWER. I should say so. I have been smeared as a Fascist and a reactionary and a company union official, and everything else.

Mr. McDOWELL. A tool of the producers?

Mr. BREWER. A tool, yes—tool of the employers and associated with reactionaries—about anything else that could be said along that line has been said about me.

Mr. McDOWELL. Have you been called a religious bigot or an anti-religious person, or whatever happened to fit at the moment?

Mr. BREWER. Well, not effectively. There have been a couple of times when rumors have been circulated, but I think they were pretty effectively squelched.

Mr. McDOWELL. Have your personal morals been attacked by these people?

Mr. BREWER. I don't think they have; not to my knowledge.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, you have missed something. [Laughter.]

Have they disturbed your comfort—the comfort of your home life at all?

Mr. BREWER. Well, as a matter of fact, there was one period during the activities in this situation when my home was guarded for a period of about 6 or 8 weeks. I had a guard every night. As a matter of fact, I received a threatening phone call and was told that if I didn't change my position with respect to one of our own unions that had come under the domination of the Communists, I wouldn't have any home. I put a guard around the home that night. At 3 o'clock that morning there was a suspicious car stop; and an unarmed officer whom we had employed stepped out to the car, and they left. From that time on, for a period of some 8 weeks, my home was guarded. I have a wife and two children who I felt needed that protection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, Mr. Brewer, do you suppose if you had gone before these people and began to scream that this is the way Hitler started things, and your constitutional rights were being subject to illegal pressure, and so forth, that would have stopped everything? You would have been free from then on?

Mr. BREWER. Well, I found that unless you have a pretty good organization behind you, no one can hear your screams over the screams that have preceded you.

Mr. McDOWELL. In other words, about the only way to protect yourself out there was with a club, wasn't it?

Mr. BREWER. Well, yes. We had to have protection from the activities which were carried on, as the evidence shows. As a matter of fact, there is without a question of a doubt an underground smear organization in the motion-picture studios that works very effectively.

It is understandable, if you analyze how they work. They will pick up some particular phase of some story which they want to amplify and distort. Sometimes it's a story such as one that was circulated about me—that I had been run out of the city of Omaha for selling out to workers. That story appeared all of a sudden all over Hollywood, and it was, I am sure, as the result of a preconceived and clearly executed plan. That is just one example of the many which we have been able to detect in their activities.

Mr. McDOWELL. Thank you. You have been a good witness.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. I have no more questions at this time. I understand that the witness is to be recalled, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The witness will be recalled some time this afternoon. So, would you stand by, Mr. Brewer?

Mr. STRIPLING. There are several matters that I would like to put in the record, which you asked for.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. STRIPLING. On Jack Stachel, Mr. Chairman—he is a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party. He is national director of the trade-union division of the Communist Party. At the Communist Party convention held January 30, 1936, in Cleveland, he made a report on the trade-union work at the convention. He has also been a member of the New York State Trade Union Commission of the Communist Party. He is a very well-known Communist figure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this morning, when Mr. Trumbo appeared before the committee, I failed to put into the record the subpoena which called for his appearance. I would like at this time to make the record clear on this point.⁶⁶

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. STRIPLING. Also to include therein two telegrams which were sent to Mr. Trumbo in connection with his appearance here.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

(The subpoena and telegrams are as follows:)

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 13, 1947.

DALTON TRUMBO,

Care of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Culver City, Calif.:

In response to the subpoena served upon you summoning you to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, in Washington, D. C., on October 23, you are hereby directed to appear on October 27 instead of October 23, at the hour of 10:30, room 226, Old House Office Building.

J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D. C., October 11, 1947.

Mr. DALTON TRUMBO,

1217 North Kings Road, Los Angeles, Calif., or

Lazy T Ranch, Stauffer, Ventura County, Calif.:

In response to the subpoena served upon you summoning you to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, in Washington, D. C., October 23, you are hereby directed to appear on October 27 instead of October 23, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., room 226, Old House Office Building.

J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman.*

⁶⁶ See appendix, p. 540, for exhibits 68-70.

(Original—32080, vol. 58, p. 421)

By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America.

To ROBERT E. CLARK, *United States Marshal*:

You are hereby commanded to summon Dalton Trumbo to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chambers in the city of Washington, on October 23, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States in the city of Washington, this 18th day of September 1947.

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk*.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will stand in recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 p. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

Attest:

J. PARNELL THOMAS.

STATEMENT OF PAUL V. McNUTT

AFTER RECESS

The committee reconvened at 2 p. m., pursuant to the recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Mr. McNUTT. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request permission to bring a matter to the attention of your committee.

The CHAIRMAN. And will you please identify yourself for the record?

Mr. McNUTT. I am Paul V. McNutt. I am here as counsel for the Motion Picture Association and the Association of Motion Picture Producers.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. McNUTT. Yesterday afternoon—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. What do you have, a long statement?

Mr. McNUTT. No; it is not a long statement.

The CHAIRMAN. May I see the statement?

(The statement was handed to the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Just show a copy to Mr. Stripling, please.

Mr. McNUTT. I have only the two copies.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will give it back to you.

Mr. McNUTT. All right, Mr. Stripling.

(A copy of the statement was handed to Mr. Stripling.)

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please, Mr. McNutt.

(After a pause:)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McNutt, we will be pleased to have you read this statement.

Mr. McNUTT. Do you wish me to sit down?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it makes no difference whether you sit down or stand up, but I would like to know, the committee would like to know, first, who you are now speaking for.

Mr. McNUTT. I am speaking for the Motion Picture Association of America and the Association of Motion Picture Producers.

The CHAIRMAN. And will you please tell the committee who are members of the Motion Picture Association of America?

Mr. McNUTT. I am perfectly willing to put into the record the list.
The CHAIRMAN. No. You tell the committee. You represent them.

Mr. McNUTT. I represent all of the larger motion-picture producers.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are they? Name them, please.

Mr. McNUTT. Warner Brothers, there is M-G-M, there is Fox—it goes on down the line.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. McNUTT. And I should like to put in the record, with the chairman's permission, all of those.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you name any more?

Mr. McNUTT. Yes; I can go on down the line. Let me have the complete list.

The CHAIRMAN. No. You represent them.

Mr. McNUTT. That is right but, as a matter of fact, there are some 60 names on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you remember four or five more?

Mr. McNUTT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Name them, please.

Mr. McNUTT. I have named Warner Brothers, M-G-M, Twentieth Century-Fox; the Universal is on that list, the Warner Bros. Studio; there are practically all of the larger studios.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. You proceed.

Mr. McNUTT. I have not memorized the members.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. McNutt, do you represent Charlie Chaplin?

Mr. McNUTT. I do not.

Mr. STRIPLING. You do not?

Mr. McNUTT. He is not a member of either association.

The CHAIRMAN. And do you represent these witnesses that we have had here these last 2 days?

Mr. McNUTT. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. But you do represent Mr. Warner?

Mr. McNUTT. Mr. Warner's organization is a member of the association.

The CHAIRMAN. And you represent Mr. Mayer?

Mr. McNUTT. Mr. Mayer's company is a member of the association.

The CHAIRMAN. And they know about this statement that you are going to read?

Mr. McNUTT. They do. R-K-O is another member of the association.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you this—

Mr. McNUTT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Do Mr. Warner and Mr. Mayer personally know about this statement?

Mr. McNUTT. Mr. Mayer does.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Warner does not know about it?

Mr. McNUTT. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. McNUTT. Yesterday afternoon the organizations I represent were accused of having tried to stifle this inquiry. This charge was made against us without proof and on the basis of insinuation and innuendo.

This is a charge which does grave damage to our industry and seriously reflects on the personal integrity, loyalty, and patriotism of individuals associated with it.

We cannot stand by and allow these vicious charges to go unchallenged before the public.

In the chairman's own words, we were accused of trying to get the committee to "lay off" the investigation.

I quote the chairman:

We had some very prominent persons in this country who, either through you—

addressing Mr. Eric Johnston—

or someone you are associated with, contacted and got in touch with us and asked us to lay off or postpone it.

The chairman also said:

And then we have had others get in touch with some of our investigators who tried all the tricks of the trade, to find out what we were going to do. One man went so far as to—he didn't offer anything, but I want to tell you he gave all the signs of an offer—all the signs of an offer.

Does the committee have any proof of these gratuitous insinuations? We want to know. The public is entitled to know.

If the charges can't stand the light of day in open and aboveboard discussion, they should not be made.

The committee has stated it intends to conduct a fair hearing and give the American public all the facts. Insinuation and innuendo are never fair and are not facts.

With respect to postponement of the hearings, I wish to quote from a press release issued by the chairman on September 19, 1947. The chairman said:

The committee had originally hoped to begin this hearing on September 29. However, a number of unforeseen circumstances have arisen regarding the membership of the committee which necessitates a delay until October 20, in order that all members may be present for this important hearing.

Our position in that respect coincides precisely with that of the chairman.

From the very beginning, we have wanted all members of this committee in presence at these hearings. The chairman did not over-emphasize it when he said the importance of these hearings demanded the presence of the full committee.

We wanted all members present to hear our story. We wanted them present so that this investigation would be the investigation to end all investigations of Hollywood by the committee.

At no time did we want to stifle the inquiry. The truth is we repeatedly asked for a full, fair, and conclusive hearing because we want to see Communists exposed wherever they may be.

Yet at another point in yesterday's hearing, the chairman said that—

It makes no difference whether you have got glamour girls out there or whether you have got a lot of funds behind you or not, if there are Communists in that industry we are going to expose them.

Statements and innuendoes of the kind made at yesterday's hearings hardly becomes a committee of the Congress which has expressed its intention to conduct a fair and impartial hearing.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McNutt, the Chair appreciates your contribution and the Chair will reply to you in a very full and detailed manner.

Mr. McNUTT. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In the meantime, however, the Chair would like to make two inquiries of you.

Does your organization employ Mr. Cahill?

Mr. McNUTT. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you know that Mr. Cahill went down to our committee chambers a number of times?

Mr. McNUTT. I did.

The CHAIRMAN. And for what reason did he go down there?

Mr. McNUTT. To get whatever information the committee was willing to offer us in order that we might be prepared.

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly; to get whatever information. You answered it yourself.

Mr. McNUTT. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. And he didn't get any.

Mr. McNUTT. In order that we might be prepared, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to ask you another question.

Mr. McNUTT. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know a Mr. Rosner who lives up here at the Shoreham Hotel?

Mr. McNUTT. I do not know Mr. Rosner.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever heard of Mr. Rosner?

Mr. McNUTT. I have heard something of him.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all; thank you.

Mr. McNUTT. We have nothing to do with Mr. Rosner, if you want to know the truth about it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. McNUTT. Disclaim anything in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. The next witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Mr. Albert Maltz.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Maltz, will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. MALTZ. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF ALBERT MALTZ (ACCOMPANIED BY ROBERT W. KENNY AND BARTLEY CRUM)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Maltz, will you state your full name and present address for the record, please?

Mr. MALTZ. My name is Albert Maltz. I live at 6526 Linden Hurst Avenue, Los Angeles.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the privilege of making a statement, please.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a prepared statement?

Mr. MALTZ. I have a prepared statement.

The CHAIRMAN. May we see it, please?

Mr. MALTZ. May I ask whether you asked Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith to see his statement before you allowed him to read it?

The CHAIRMAN. I wasn't chairman at that time.

Mr. MALTZ. Nevertheless you were on the committee, Mr. Thomas, were you not?

The CHAIRMAN. I asked him a great many questions and he had a hard time answering some of them, too.

Mr. MALTZ. I am interested in that, but I still would like to know whether he had his statement read before he was permitted to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we will look at yours.

Mr. MALTZ. I gather that you don't want to answer my question, Mr. Chairman.

(After a pause:)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Maltz, the committee is unanimous in permitting you to read the statement.

Mr. MALTZ. Thank you.

I am an American and I believe there is no more proud word in the vocabulary of man. I am a novelist and a screen writer and I have produced a certain body of work in the past 15 years. As with any other writer, what I have written has come from the total fabric of my life—my birth in this land, our schools and games, our atmosphere of freedom, our tradition of inquiry, criticism, discussion, tolerance. Whatever I am, America has made me. And I, in turn, possess no loyalty as great as the one I have to this land, to the economic and social welfare of its people, to the perpetuation and development of its democratic way of life.

Now at the age of 39, I am commanded to appear before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For a full week this committee has encouraged an assortment of well-rehearsed witnesses to testify that I and others are subversive and un-American. It has refused us the opportunity that any pickpocket receives in a magistrate's court—the right to cross-examine these witnesses, to refute their testimony, to reveal their motives, their history, and who, exactly, they are. Furthermore it grants these witnesses congressional immunity so that we may not sue them for libel for their slanders.

I maintain that this is an evil and vicious procedure; that it is legally unjust and morally indecent—and that it places in danger every other American, since if the rights of any one citizen can be invaded, then the constitutional guaranties of every other American have been subverted and no one is any longer protected from official tyranny.

What is it about me that this committee wishes to destroy? My writings? Very well, let us refer to them.

My novel, *The Cross and the Arrow*, was issued in a special edition of 140,000 copies by a wartime Government agency, the armed services edition, for American servicemen abroad.

My short stories have been reprinted in over 30 anthologies, by as many American publishers—all subversive, no doubt.

My film, *The Pride of the Marines*, was premiered in 28 cities at Guadalcanal Day banquets under the auspices of the United States Marine Corps.

Another film, *Destination Tokyo*, was premiered aboard a United States submarine and was adopted by the Navy as an official training film.

My short film, *The House I Live In*, was given a special award by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences for its contribution to racial tolerance.

My short story, *The Happiest Man on Earth*, won the 1938 O. Henry Memorial Award for the best American short story.

This, then, is the body of work for which this committee urges I be blacklisted in the film industry—and tomorrow, if it has its way in the publishing and magazine fields also.

By cold censorship, if not legislation, I must not be allowed to write. Will this censorship stop with me? Or with the others now singled out for attack? If it requires acceptance of the ideas of this committee to remain immune from the brand of un-Americanism, then who is ultimately safe from this committee except members of the Ku Klux Klan?

Why else does this committee now seek to destroy me and others? Because of our ideas, unquestionably. In 1801, when he was President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson wrote:

Opinion, and the just maintenance of it, shall never be a crime in my view: nor bring injury to the individual.

But a few years ago, in the course of one of the hearings of this committee, Congressman J. Parnell Thomas said, and I quote from the official transcript:

I just want to say this now, that it seems that the New Deal is working along hand in glove with the Communist Party. The New Deal is either for the Communist Party or it is playing into the hands of the Communist Party.

Very well, then, here is the other reason why I and others have been commanded to appear before this committee—our ideas. In common with many Americans, I supported the New Deal. In common with many Americans I supported, against Mr. Thomas and Mr. Rankin, the antilynching bill. I opposed them in my support of OPA controls and emergency veteran housing and a fair employment practices law. I signed petitions for these measures, joined organizations that advocated them, contributed money, sometimes spoke from public platforms, and I will continue to do so. I will take my philosophy from Thomas Payne, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and I will not be dictated to or intimidated by men to whom the Ku Klux Klan, as a matter of committee record, is an acceptable American institution.

I state further that on many questions of public interest my opinions as a citizen have not always been in accord with the opinions of the majority. They are not now nor have my opinions ever been fixed and unchanging, nor are they now fixed and unchangeable; but, right or wrong, I claim and I insist upon my right to think freely and to speak freely; to join the Republican Party or the Communist Party, the Democratic or the Prohibition Party; to publish whatever I please; to fix my mind or change my mind, without dictation from anyone; to offer any criticism I think fitting of any public official or policy; to join whatever organizations I please, no matter what certain legislators may think of them. Above all, I challenge the right of this committee to inquire into my political or religious beliefs, in any manner or degree, and I assert that not only the conduct of this committee but its very existence are a subversion of the Bill of Rights.

If I were a spokesman for General Franco, I would not be here today. I would rather be here. I would rather die than be a shabby

American, groveling before men whose names are Thomas and Rankin, but who now carry out activities in America like those carried out in Germany by Goebbels and Himmler.

The American people are going to have to choose between the Bill of Rights and the Thomas committee. They cannot have both. One or the other must be abolished in the immediate future.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling (pounding gavel).

Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Maltz, what is your occupation?

Mr. MALTZ. I am a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you employed in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. MALTZ. I work in various fields of writing and I have sometimes accepted employment in the motion-picture industry.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you written the scripts for a number of pictures?

Mr. MALTZ. It is a matter of public record that I have written scripts for certain motion pictures.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

The CHAIRMAN. Louder, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. MALTZ. Next you are going to ask me what religious group I belong to.

The CHAIRMAN. No, no; we are not.

Mr. MALTZ. And any such question as that——

The CHAIRMAN. I know.

Mr. MALTZ. Is an obvious attempt to invade my rights under the Constitution.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you object to answering whether or not you are a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. MALTZ. I have not objected to answering that question. On the contrary, I point out that next you are going to ask me whether or not I am a member of a certain religious group and suggest that I be blacklisted from an industry because I am a member of a group you don't like.

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Maltz, do you decline to answer the question?

Mr. MALTZ. I certainly do not decline to answer the question. I have answered the question.

Mr. STRIPLING. I repeat, Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. MALTZ. And I repeat my answer, sir, that any such question is an obvious attempt to invade my list of organizations as an American citizen and I would be a shabby American if I didn't answer as I have.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Maltz, are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MALTZ. Next you are going to ask what my religious beliefs are.

Mr. McDOWELL. That is not answering the question.

Mr. MALTZ. And you are going to insist before various members of the industry that since you do not like my religious beliefs I should not work in such industry. Any such question is quite irrelevant.

Mr. STRIPLING. I repeat the question. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. MALTZ. I have answered the question, Mr. Quisling. I am sorry. I want you to know——

Mr. McDowell. I object to that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Excuse the witness. No more questions. Typical Communist line.

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. Before the witness leaves the stand I would like for his counsel, Mr. Kenny, to take the stand for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. No. I want this witness to leave the stand, and then Mr. Kenny will take the stand.

Mr. MALTZ. Let's go on with the rigged record.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kenny, will you please take the stand? Raise your right hand, please.

Mr. STRIPLING. Your right hand.

The CHAIRMAN. Your right hand.

Mr. CRUM. He cannot raise his right hand.

The CHAIRMAN. He cannot?

Mr. CRUM. No; he is crippled.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. KENNY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT W. KENNY

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Kenny, the reason for calling you to the stand this afternoon is a newspaper article which appeared in this afternoon's Times-Herald.

Mr. KENNY. Yes; I saw that too.

The CHAIRMAN. I would just like to read it to you so that you are sure you know what I am referring to:

Counsel for 19 "defense witnesses" in the House Reds-in-filmland investigation said today he would advise all his clients to invite prosecution by refusing to say whether they are Communists. * * *

Hollywood attorney Robert W. Kenny said he would also advise the other 18 "to walk the plank."

Mr. Kenny, is that a correct quotation?

Mr. KENNY. Well, Mr. Thomas, you put me in a doubly embarrassing position. As a former newspaperman I have always made it a practice never to disavow anything that is ever printed in a newspaper. The other problem, of course, is the relationship between attorney and client and that is also a privileged situation.

I may say, however, that what I have said—and words are poor conveyors of meaning—is that the brief that I submitted to you and the other members of the committee has also been read by my clients and that I hoped that they would follow the law that is set out in that brief.

Now, if you recall the brief—

The CHAIRMAN. I recall the brief. What I want to know is, first, is that a correct quotation?

Mr. KENNY. Well, I will have to say that it is not quite correct.

The CHAIRMAN. Not quite correct?

Mr. KENNY. But I have also said that what a witness does in his relation with this committee is a matter between the committee and the witness. The best that we lawyers can do is to give the client the best constitutional advice that we can. And that is exactly what I

embraced in the brief, which recited that we felt that this committee was unconstitutional and illegal.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Here is what I am driving at. What I would like to know is did you advise your clients, who are to be witnesses here, three of whom have already taken the stand and refused to answer questions—

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Thomas, I am sure—

The CHAIRMAN. Did you advise your clients not to answer questions put to them by the committee or its chief investigator?

Mr. KENNY. You are not a lawyer, Mr. Thomas, and, as I think your counsel, or someone, would advise you, that would be highly inappropriate. If there is one thing that is sacred in this country it is the matter of advice that a counsel gives his clients.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. KENNY. I am sure you didn't intend to invade that.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate that. I am not a lawyer; I admit that.

Mr. KENNY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. But I would like to know, as the chairman of a congressional committee, whether or not you, as the attorney for these witnesses, advised them not to answer questions put to them by this congressional committee or its chief investigator.

Mr. KENNY. Mr. Thomas, I would be disgraced before every one of 100,000 lawyers in the United States if I answered that question. That is one thing that cannot be answered.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you got the statute there, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to read the statute, because if you did give them that advice you would be doing everything you possibly could to frustrate the congressional committee, and you would be in more serious trouble than some of your witnesses.

Mr. KENNY. Well, Mr. Thomas, I am not here to be lectured by this committee. I do think that it is the highest impropriety to ask a lawyer what advice he gave his client.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to read this statute.

Mr. KENNY. Oh, yes; surely.

The CHAIRMAN. This is Criminal Code section 37, Conspiring To Commit an Offense Against the United States:

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States or to defraud the United States, in any manner, or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years or both.

Dated March 4, 1909.

Now, then, you say that this Times article is not a correct reporting?

Mr. KENNY. Yes, Mr. Thomas. I had told you that I cannot, of course, tell you what advice I have given my clients. That is obviously, without being dramatic about it, that would be an invasion of one of the most sacred rights—like the right between a person who confesses and one who receives the confession, or a doctor and patient. Those are all the most privileged communications that we have.

The CHAIRMAN. No, no. I am asking you now about a statement you made to the newspaper, not about a statement made to your clients.

Mr. KENNY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Now it has to do with a statement made to the newspapers. Did you make this statement to the newspaper?

MR. KENNY. No. What I told the committee earlier was what I had said to the newspaper in response to an inquiry as to what the course would be taken by my clients, that my clients had all had an opportunity of reading the same brief that I had given to this committee, and that I hoped that my clients might have a higher respect for my legal learning than this committee has.

THE CHAIRMAN. I see; yes. Well, I hope they do. [Laughter.]

I still get back to the newspaper—

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt?

THE CHAIRMAN. Just a moment.

MR. STRIPLING. It is the United Press.

THE CHAIRMAN. Still getting back to the newspaper article, in what way is this article, has the article failed to report what you said?

MR. KENNY. Well, I will have to examine it.

THE CHAIRMAN. The one I just read.

MR. KENNY. I will have to examine it, Mr. Thomas, please.

(After a pause:)

MR. KENNY. Well, this, as I say, puts me in the position of disavowing a newspaperman; but newspapermen aren't all lawyers; some exnewspapermen are—and I did not say that I would advise my clients to invite prosecution. That is the first paragraph. That is simply something that I did not advise my clients at all.

THE CHAIRMAN. You didn't?

MR. KENNY. Because I think my clients have all behaved themselves in a manner that would not invite a successful prosecution.

Now, let's see the next paragraph. That doesn't refer to me.

Kenny said—

Pardon me. You will pardon the expression—

he also would advise the other 18 "to walk the plank."

Well now, what I undoubtedly did say is that they are probably going to be invited to walk the plank. I don't advise anybody to walk any plank. I am not that bad a lawyer.

THE CHAIRMAN. I will tell you, Mr. Kenny, as chairman, I want to let you know that you squirmed out of this one temporarily, but if the committee should determine that is a violation of this Conspiracy Act, then the committee will take under consideration referring the matter to the United States attorney.

MR. KENNY. That is right, Mr. Thomas. I might say that the committee has squirmed out of one too, because I am sure that committee did not intend to invade the sacred province of relationship between attorney and client.

THE CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; and neither would you want to commit conspiracy.

MR. KENNY. Neither one of us are intimidated; is that right, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN. We will have the next witness.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I think we should get the record straight as to the extensive Communist record of Mr. Maltz before we proceed any further.

MR. KENNY. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if there will be an opportunity somewhere along for counsel to register an objection and a motion to strike the testimony concerning these dossiers of the witness

Maltz, the witness Lawson, the witness Trumbo, who have appeared already, on the ground that they are hearsay?

The CHAIRMAN. When we hear all of these witnesses—I think there are 18 or 19; I think maybe you are losing a couple—but anyway, 18 or 19, when we have heard all of them, and we have got these dossiers, as you call them, well fixed in the record, we will be very pleased to have you make a motion.

Mr. CRUM. Thank you.

Mr. KENNY. May I at that time argue it rather fully and orally?

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, fully.

Mr. Stripling, proceed.

Mr. STRIPLING. I ask that Mr. Russell take the stand.

Mr. Russell has previously been sworn and identified.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, as a member of the investigators' staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities, were you instructed to make an investigation to determine whether or not Albert Maltz was a member of the Communist Party?

The CHAIRMAN. Have more order, please.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give me the result of your investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. During the course of my investigation I was furnished with information regarding the Communist Party registration card of Albert Maltz. I have a photostatic copy of this registration card before me.⁵⁷

This card is made out in the name of Albert M, which was a code name used for Albert Maltz in the execution of his Communist Party registration card. This card bears the number 47196. The address of Albert M is given as 8526 Linden Hurst; city, Los Angeles; county, Los Angeles; State, California. This card contains a notation "1944 card No. 46801." The card contains a description of Albert M.

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Russell. Does it state the date on which a new card was issued?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was the date.

Mr. RUSSELL. November 30, 1944.

The description of Albert M as appears on the card is given as: Sex, male; occupation, writer; industry, motion-picture. The question is then asked: "Member of C. I. O., A. F. of L., independent union, or no union?" The notation "Independent union" is checked.

The question is then asked: Member club subscriber for Daily Worker. The answer "Yes" is checked.

This registration card is for the year 1944.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, that is all of Mr. Russell.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STRIPLING. I should like to place in the record, Mr. Chairman, the subpoena which was issued on September 18 by the chairman of the committee calling for the appearance of Albert Maltz before the committee on October 23 at 10:30 a. m. This subpoena was served on Mr. Maltz on September 19, 1947, by Andrew Bayar, deputy

⁵⁷ See appendix, p. 540, for exhibit.71.

marshal, for Robert E. Clark, United States marshal, Los Angeles, Calif.⁵⁸

I should also like to place into the record a telegram which the chairman sent to Mr. Maltz which reads as follows:

In response to the subpoena served upon you summoning you to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, in Washington, D. C., on October 23, you are hereby directed to appear on October 28 instead of October 23, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., Room 226, Old House Office Building.

J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman*.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

MR. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have here a memorandum of the numerous affiliations of Albert Maltz, which is single spaced and appears on 15 pages. What is the pleasure of the committee regarding the reading of this memorandum?

I might say, Mr. Chairman, it lists 58 different Communist affiliations of the individual.

The CHAIRMAN. How many?

MR. STRIPLING. Fifty-eight.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, start reading.

MR. STRIPLING. Information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, on the Communist Affiliations of Albert Maltz (reading):

Albert Maltz, novelist, playwright, and screen writer, was born in Brooklyn, N. Y., on October 8, 1908, according to *Who's Who* for 1946-47. The International Motion Picture Almanac states that Albert Maltz wrote the screen play for the following films:

This Gun For Hire (Paramount 1942); Destination Tokyo (Warner Bros., 1943); The Man in Half Moon Street (Paramount, 1944); Pride of the Marines (Warner Bros., 1945)—

Mr. Chairman, I suppose we could suspend with the reading of the films.

MR. McDOWELL. Repeat that again.

MR. STRIPLING. I would like to suspend with a further reading of the scripts which he has written.

MR. McDOWELL. All right, without objection, they are placed in the record.

(The films referred to are as follows:)

Cloak and Dagger (Warner Bros., 1946) and Moscow Strikes Back (Republic, 1942), a documentary film. *Who's Who* for 1946-47 reflects that Albert Maltz also wrote the screen play for Deep Valley, 1944. The Los Angeles Daily News for May 15, 1945, reported that Albert Maltz was the author of the screen play for the film The House I Live In (RKO). The Hollywood Reporter for December 1, 1944, announced that screen directors Robert Rossen and Lewis Milestone (whose records are attached) had recently purchased screen rights to The Cross and the Arrow, a novel written by Albert Maltz, and that the directors would develop the novel into a motion picture. The novel was highly praised by People's World, official west coast Communist organ, and Communist book clubs.

MR. STRIPLING. The files, records, and publications of the House Committee on Un-American Activities reveal the following information regarding the pro-Communist activities of Albert Maltz (reading):

1. Albert Maltz has not to our knowledge publicly admitted membership in the Communist Party. However, complete loyalty to the Communist Party has

⁵⁸ See appendix, p. 540, for exhibit 72.

seldom been so startlingly demonstrated as it has been in the case of Mr. Maltz. The outstanding demonstration occurred when Mr. Maltz started a literary and communistic furor by criticizing the traditional Communist premise that "art is a weapon." His criticism was contained in an article in the *New Masses*, official weekly publication of the Communist Party, on February 12, 1946.⁵⁹ This heresy by Mr. Maltz was immediately denounced by Communist leaders at mass meeting and in article upon article in the *New Masses* and other official party publications. On April 7, 1946, Mr. Maltz yielded to the pressure and publicly recanted his statements in an article in the *Worker*, official newspaper of the Communist Party.⁶⁰ This controversy, which attracted Nation-wide attention, has been reviewed in *Life* magazine for July 29, 1946; in the *Washington Post* for February 25, 1946; and in the *New York World-Telegram* for September 18, 1946. The *Washington Post* said in part:

"It seems that a Communist critic, one Comrade Albert Maltz, had dared to say, almost in as many words, that a literary artist need not be expected to turn himself inside out trying to keep up with every kink and kidney bending in the party line." The *World-Telegram* noted that: "The Party promptly dropped a ton of bricks on Mr. Maltz." *Life* magazine observed thus about Mr. Maltz' recanting: "Folding completely before the party discipline, Maltz, even castigated his sympathizers who had objected to the abusive tone in which correction had been administered."

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask Mr. Gaston to read it [memorandum concerning Communist activity and affiliations of Albert Maltz]. Go ahead and read it.

Mr. GASTON (reading). On at least four occasions Albert Maltz has publicly supported the Communist Party. The *Daily Worker*, official Communist newspaper, on May 4, 1936, page 2, announced that one of Albert Maltz' plays would be given for the benefit of the Communist Party. The *Daily Worker*, for March 5, 1941, page 2, reported that Mr. Maltz was one of the signers of a statement to the President defending the Communist Party, and on July 19, 1942, page 4, the same publication listed Mr. Maltz as a signer of an open letter denouncing former Attorney General Biddle's charges against the Communist Party and Communist Party member Harry Bridges. The *New Leader* for February 8, 1941, listed Mr. Maltz as being on the "call" of a conference to keep the Communist Party on the State ballot in New York.

3. On July 21, 1940, page 1, the *Worker* announced that Albert Maltz would write a serial story, *The Underground Stream*, depicting the life of a Communist organizer and hero. The Communist Party's official organ, the *Daily Worker*, said on January 25, 1943, in an article by the *Worker* columnist and Party member Mike Gold, that: "I can think of almost no American author who has done an adequate portrait of an American Communist. Albert Maltz in 'Underground Stream' did a wonderful sketch but not a sufficiently rounded portrait of the American Communist." The Communist Party organizer and hero of "The Underground Stream" is a character named Frank Prince who is killed by a Black Legion crew on orders of the management of an industrial plant because the organizer refused to desert the Communist Party. Prince had become a Communist, Maltz writes, as a result of "daily events, his work and life—and among those events a tire chain yielded by a policeman * * * later, the acceptance of certain principles, of the political program for which the Communist movement stood, had kept him in the party" (p. 103).

4. The *Daily Worker* of June 8, 1938, announced that "The New York State Committee of the Communist Party will honor a group of 20 students who will complete the 2-week National Training School for State Literary Directors on June 15, 1938." Albert Maltz was named by the *Daily Worker* article as one of the main speakers at the event. He was to share the speaking platform with such prominent Communists as Alexander Trachtenberg and Michael Gold.

5. The John Reed Clubs were openly communistic organizations named in honor of John Reed, one of the founders of the Communist Party in the United States, and whose ashes were interred in the Kremlin in Moscow. The *Daily Worker* for February 10, 1934, listed Albert Maltz as a speaker at a John Reed Club symposium in New York City.

6. Other Communist individuals have been defended by Albert Maltz on a number of occasions. Mr. Maltz is a member of the Eisler Defense Committee,

⁵⁹ See pp. 152-157 for complete text.

⁶⁰ See pp. 158-162 for complete text.

which the Communists organized after Gerhart Eisler, an agent of the Communist International, was convicted in the United States courts of passport fraud and contempt of Congress. Mr. Maltz' affiliation with the organization is recorded in a pamphlet of the committee, entitled "Eisler Hits Back," page 15. Mr. Maltz also signed an appeal to the President under the auspices of the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder, according to a leaflet of the organization. Earl Browder is the former general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States. The committee in his defense was cited as a Communist organization by Attorney General Biddle (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7687) and by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The New York Times for October 9, 1944, page 12, listed Albert Maltz as a signer of an open letter sent to Governor Dewey of New York by the Schappes Defense Committee. This committee worked for the release of Morris U. Schappes, an avowed Communist teacher convicted of perjury in New York City, and the committee was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The Daily Worker for December 19, 1940, page 5, listed Albert Maltz as one of the signers of an appeal on behalf of Sam Darcy, a Communist organizer. Mr. Maltz' defense of Harry Bridges has previously been referred to. Mr. Bridges led the disastrous San Francisco general strike of 1934 and was identified as a Communist Party member by the Daily Worker itself.

7. Albert Maltz has been associated with many official Communist publications. He has written for the Daily Worker, as shown by the issues of the publication for December 16, 1933; September 17, 1934; and December 21, 1935. Mr. Maltz has also taken an interest in the Daily Worker's financial problems. The publication on March 25, 1945, listed Mr. Maltz as a member of a committee "to sponsor support for the Daily Worker and The Worker" (the Sunday edition). The article stated under a headline reading "Leading citizens sponsor financial aid for worker" that "The committee has a wide representation of people who in their daily active work have come to accept the Daily Worker and The Worker as indispensable journals of opinion and action." Similar information is carried in the Daily Worker for April 1, 1945.

8. New Masses is an official weekly magazine of the Communist Party. That Albert Maltz has been a contributor to New Masses is proven by the issues of the publication for December 15, 1936, page 37; January 26, 1937, page 25; and August 17, 1937, page 16. The Western Worker, an official Communist publication, announced on November 30, 1936, that Albert Maltz would be among the contributors to New Masses when the New Masses' twenty-fifth anniversary issue was put out on December 10, 1936. The Daily Worker for October 7, 1938, reported that an emergency meeting held for New Masses on the same day at the Manhattan Opera House in New York City would include a speech by Albert Maltz. The issue of New Masses for April 2, 1940, page 21, listed Albert Maltz as one of the signers of a New Masses letter to the President. Albert Maltz served on the sponsoring committee of a morale meeting for Romain Rolland—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gaston, on what page are you now?

Mr. GASTON. Page 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Page 3?

Mr. GASTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the number of the citation?

Mr. GASTON. No. 8.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 58 citations all told?

Mr. GASTON. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the committee has some objection, we will suspend further reading and place it in the record from this point on.

Mr. GASTON. All right, sir, fine.

(The document referred to is as follows:)

—which the New Masses held at Carnegie Hall in New York on March 30, 1945. This was reported in the Daily Worker for March 14, 1945, and New Masses for April 16, 1945.

9. New Currents is a weekly magazine in the English language dealing with Jewish matters. It has the official approval of the Jewish Commission of the Communist Party and has been cited as a Communist organization by the Committee on Un-American Activities on September 2, 1947. The issue of New Cur-

rents for March 1944, page 2, lists Albert Maltz as a member of the advisory board of the magazine.

10. *Mainstream* is a literary magazine which has been prominently promoted by the Communist press and which advertises itself in the *Daily Worker* as a "Marxist literary quarterly." The *Worker* for September 22, 1946, lists Albert Maltz as a member of the editorial board of *Mainstream*.

11. *People's World* is the official west coast organ of the Communist Party. Albert Maltz was a speaker at a meeting entitled "Hollywood Forum" which was held in Los Angeles on April 9, 1946, under the auspices of the *People's World*, according to the *Daily Worker* for April 15, 1946, page 11. The *People's World* of July 26, 1944, reported that it would run a short-story contest between August 1, 1944, and February 1, 1945, and that Albert Maltz would be one of the judges of the contest. The *People's World* for June 1, 1945, said it was running a short-story contest and that Mr. Maltz was serving as a judge.

12. Among other associations with the Communist press, Albert Maltz is shown to have served on the editorial council of *Equality*, according to issues of the magazine for July 1939, June 1940, and July 1940. *Equality*, which appeared from May 1939, until late 1940, consistently followed the Communist Party line and its managing editor was Abraham Chapman who has been identified as John Arnold, a member of the New York State Jewish Bureau of the Communist Party. Albert Maltz was one of the incorporators of Jewish Survey, according to records of incorporation of New York State. Jewish Survey, incorporated in 1939 and dissolved on December 2, 1942, was run by writers for the Communist press such as Louis Harap. Contributors included David Zaslavsky of the Moscow *Pravda* and Max Perlow and Albert E. Kahn, well-known Communist leaders. Mr. Maltz was a contributor to *Laissez*, official Communist publication in the Lithuanian language field, according to a copy of the paper for May 28, 1941. Mr. Maltz also contributed to *Neues Deutschland* (New Germany), official organ of the Free German Committee of Mexico, which had its headquarters in Moscow and which consisted largely of Communist refugees like Otto Katz and Paul Merker. He contributed to the January 1945 issue and the March and April 1946 issues of *Neues Deutschland*. It should be noted that it is standard practice for the *Daily Worker* and other Communist publications to accept only Communist Party members for official positions on the publications. It need scarcely be observed that contributors to such publications are required to follow the Communist Party line in their writings.

13. Official Communist publishing houses have published works by Albert Maltz. Mr. Maltz is listed as one of the authors in an International Publishers catalog, undated, and also in a catalog issued by the Workers Library Publishers in 1938. International Publishers in 1935 published a book entitled "Proletarian Literature in the United States" which included one of Albert Maltz' short stories. The *Daily Worker* for July 12, 1938, announced that International Publishers was issuing a book of short stories by Mr. Maltz entitled "The Way Things Are." The Department of Justice has cited International Publishers as a "publishing agency of the Communist Party" (brief in the case of William Schneiderman, p. 145). It has been similarly cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944.

14. Official Communist sources have frequently voiced approval of Albert Maltz' writings. Communist International, the official organ of the Communist International, on the back cover of its May 1938 issue advertised Mr. Maltz' book, *The Way Things Are*, and described the book as "a book of stirring stories of the class struggle in the United States." The official west coast Communist organ, the *People's World*, on January 4, 1945, page 5, listed Mr. Maltz' book. The *Cross and the Arrow*, as one of the 25 best books of 1944 and the reviewer stated that: "With this novel Maltz earned a position among the leading figures in American fiction today." The Progressive Book Shop, one of a Nation-wide chain of Communist book shops, held a Meet the Author Party to publicize Maltz' book, *The Cross and the Arrow*, according to the *California Eagle* for October 5, 1944. Albert Maltz himself testified before the California Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities on October 13, 1944, that the Progressive Book Shop had sponsored an autographing party for this book of his. The *Cross and the Arrow* was made a selection of the Book Find Club, according to *Plain Talk* for May 1947, page 28. The Book Find Club is a Communist version of the book-of-the-month clubs and promotes the writings of authors sympathetic to the Communist viewpoint. The Abraham Lincoln School, Chicago, has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and has been refused support by the American Federation of Labor in

Chicago on the grounds of "communistic affiliations." The Daily Worker for April 21, 1946, announced that a literary criticism seminar of the Abraham Lincoln School would be held for the purpose of giving writers, critics, and others interested in evaluating the Marxist criticism of literature an opportunity to discuss the works of Albert Maltz and others.

15. The Los Angeles Workers' School was a Communist school directed by Eva Shafran, a Communist organizer; La Rue McCormick, who was a Communist candidate for California State senator, served on the board of directors of the school. Albert Maltz was a lecturer at the school during its spring and summer sessions in 1943, according to official pamphlets of the school and also the issues of the People's World for April 16, 1943, page 5; April 23, 1943, page 5; May 7, 1943, page 5; May 13, 1943, page 5; May 21, 1943, page 5; and July 14, 1943, page 3.

16. The People's Educational Center started in Los Angeles in the fall of 1943, is the successor to the Los Angeles Workers' School. It was cited as a Communist-front organization by the California State Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities and records show that the center's staff and faculty include numerous card-holding members of the Communist Party, such as Carl Winters, Eva Shafran, Mildred Raskin, and Bruce Minton. The People's World for December 2, 1943, reported that the People's Educational Association, the sponsoring organization for the People's Educational Center, met during the previous week in the Hotel Hollywood in Los Angeles and that one of the persons representing the association at the meeting was Albert Maltz. The same article said Mr. Maltz urged the association to establish a Hollywood branch of the People's Educational Center and offered for the use of such a branch the League of American Writers School at 1717 North Vine Street. The Labor Herald for June 1, 1945, announced that a bimonthly forum by the People's Educational Center was scheduled to begin on June 10, 1945, with Albert Maltz leading a discussion on What To Do With Germany.

17. The Workers Book Shop, 50 East Thirteenth Street, New York City, is headquarters of a chain of Communist bookshops, which are the official outlets for Communist literature and at which tickets for Communist Party and front functions customarily are sold. The New York Workers Book Shop put out a pamphlet in 1938 entitled "Very Urgent," which requested money for the Workers Book Shop mural fund. Albert Maltz was listed in the pamphlet as one of the active sponsors.

18. Albert Maltz has been affiliated with numerous organizations which specialize in the defense of Communists. The International Labor Defense has been described as the legal arm of the Communist Party by Attorney General Biddle and has been cited for its Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities. Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom, Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the California Committee on Un-American Activities, Equal Justice was a publication of the International Labor Defense. Albert Maltz was one of the signers of an open letter to Attorney General Biddle which appeared in Equal Justice for the spring of 1942.

19. The National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which specialized in defending Communists also, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Biddle also cited the organization, pointing out that it had defended such prominent Communists as Sam Darcy and Robert Wood, party secretaries for Pennsylvania and Oklahoma, respectively. An official program leaflet listed Albert Maltz as one of the sponsors of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America, which was held in Washington, D. C., June 7 through 9, 1940, and out of which grew the organization, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. Albert Maltz was listed as a sponsor of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties on a letterhead of the organization dated November 6, 1940. Mr. Maltz has also signed appeals in behalf of the Communist Party and individual Communists under the auspices of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, according to the Daily Worker for December 19, 1940, page 5, and July 19, 1942, page 4.

20. The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was a Communist-front organization specializing in the defense of Communists and closely interlocked with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. The Inalienable Rights Conference was cited for its Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. The New Leader

for February 8, 1941, reports that Albert Maltz was on the "Call" of the Inalienable Rights Conference to keep the Communist Party on the State ballot in New York.

21. The Civil Rights Congress is the successor of the International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party. The House Committee on Un-American Activities, in a report on September 2, 1947, described the Civil Rights Congress as "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party." This congress is now defending such persons as Gerhart Eisler, agent of the Communist International, convicted of passport fraud, and Eugene Dennis, Communist Party general secretary convicted of contempt of Congress. A letterhead dated May 11, 1946, shows that Albert Maltz is a public sponsor of an organization entitled "Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York," which is an acknowledged part of the Civil Rights Congress.

22. The Committee for Citizenship Rights was avowedly organized to oppose the threatened revocation of citizenship of William Schneiderman, Communist Party organizer, according to a letter of the organization dated January 10, 1942. It was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The same letter referred to above listed Albert Maltz as an endorser of the Committee for Citizenship Rights.

23. The American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born, which also specializes in defending Communists, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. An undated leaflet of the organization shows that Albert Maltz served on the board of directors of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born. The organization defended such foreign-born Communists as Gerhart Eisler and Harry Bridges.

24. The National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners and the National Committee for People's Rights were cited as Communist fronts by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Biddle (in the Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7686) stated that the "National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners is substantially equivalent to International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party"; he also pointed out that the organization had defended such Communists as Earl Browder and Angelo Herndon. "In January, 1938," the Attorney General stated further, "its (National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners) name was changed to the National Committee for People's Rights." Albert Maltz was a member of the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners, according to a list submitted by Joseph S. Gelders, the organization's southern representative, in testifying before the La Follette committee in Washington, D. C., on January 14, 1937. The National Committee for People's Rights listed Albert Maltz as one of the members of its national committee who was eligible for election to its executive committee, according to a mimeographed announcement put out by the organization in November 1941.

25. International Workers Order is a fraternal organization which Attorney General Biddle cited as "one of the strongest Communist organizations." (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688). It was also cited as subversive by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942, by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April, 1940, and by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in 1943. New Masses for August 27, 1940, page 21, listed Albert Maltz as one of the sponsors of a plays-for-children contest, sponsored by the junior section of the International Workers Order.

26. Albert Maltz has shown an active interest in the Soviet Union. The People's World, of March 11, 1943, carried a picture of Mr. Maltz and described him as a famous American writer who had sent the following telegram to the editors of National Defense, a literary magazine in Moscow: "Please use my literary royalties for the defense of the Soviet Union. Greetings, Albert Maltz." The article reflects that royalties were due Maltz in Moscow for several works.

27. The Daily Worker for January 18, 1943, has an article entitled "Writers of the World Meet in the Page of a Soviet Magazine," which points out that Soviet readers are obtaining literature of American writers through a monthly magazine published by the State Literary Publishing House and that one of the American writers who have had articles published in that magazine is Albert Maltz.

28. The Daily Worker for April 28, 1938, page 4, reflects that Albert Maltz was a signer of a statement by the American Progressives Defending the Moscow

Trials, which was the usual name affixed to a series of trials then being held in the Soviet Union for numerous opponents of Dictator Stalin. It has been established that these trials had for their aim the purging of all political enemies of Joseph Stalin.

29. Soviet Russia Today was the official monthly publication of the Friends of the Soviet Union, a predecessor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. The magazine was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The issue of Soviet Russia Today for September 1941, page 30, carried the name of Albert Maltz as author of a statement in support of the Soviet Union. The Daily Worker for September 3, 1941, in an article entitled, "Soviet Victory Vital to Preserve Cultural Heritage, Basic Economic Values," reported that Albert Maltz was one of a number of persons whose statements expressing their solidarity with the Soviet Union would be published in the magazine, Soviet Russia Today.

30. The National Council of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The People's World for October 23, 1943, page 3, stated that Albert Maltz was a member of the Hollywood Motion Picture Committee of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

31. The American Russian Institute, which was founded in 1926 as an alleged clearing house for "factual" information on the Soviet Union, was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in a report of June 12, 1947. A program put out by the American Russian Institute announces a premier showing of Turning Point, a Soviet film, on January 3, 1947, at the Sunset Theater in Hollywood and also announces that Albert Maltz would take part in a panel discussion following the film showing.

32. Many Communist front organizations which supported Soviet foreign policy have been backed by Albert Maltz. The American League Against War and Fascism was active in support of Soviet foreign policy against the democracies between 1932 and 1937. It has been cited by Attorney General Biddle as an organization seeking "to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited this organization as subversive on January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944. The League was dedicated to an openly treasonous program. Albert Maltz has contributed to Fight, a publication put out by the executive committee of the American League Against War and Fascism, according to an issue of Fight for November, 1933, pages 8 and 9.

33. After the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed in 1939, the Communists established the American Peace Mobilization, which opposed lend lease, aid to Britain, the defense program, and picketed the White House. It also supported a number of strikes in defense industries. The organization was cited as a Communist front by Attorney General Biddle, by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities and by the California Committee on Un-American Activities. An official program listed Albert Maltz as a sponsor of a meeting held by the American Peace Mobilization in New York City on April 5 and 6, 1941.

34. Among the Communist fronts that sprang up when the Soviet Union and the United States were allies in a war against fascism was the Artists' Front to Win the War, which made its debut at a mass meeting at Carnegie Hall in New York City on October 16, 1942. The organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The official program of the Artists' Front to Win the War meeting at Carnegie Hall listed Albert Maltz as one of the sponsors. The meeting supported the then current Communist line calling for a second front.

35. The Win the Peace Conference was held in Washington, D. C., from April 5 to 7, 1946, to attack American foreign policy. It was repudiated by a number of noted sponsors and was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on June 12, 1947, and September 2, 1947. The conference resulted in the formation of an organization called the National Committee to Win the Peace. Albert Maltz was a sponsor of the Win the Peace Conference, according to an article in the Baltimore Sunday Sun for March 31, 1946. Thus, Mr. Maltz has thus publicly avowed his allegiance to the line of the Communist Party during four distinctly divergent periods.

36. At the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International, held in Moscow in 1935, George Dimitroff, general secretary, called upon all affiliated Communist Parties to make the greatest efforts in behalf of the campaign of the Spanish Communists who were active in Spain's civil war. Among the projects organized by the American Communists in response to this request was the Theater Committee for Defense of the Spanish Republic.

37. Communists efforts in behalf of Spanish Communists continued after the civil war ended in 1939. Among these later organizations was the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade which was cited for its Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. The Abraham Lincoln Brigade was composed largely of Americans fighting on the side of the Loyalists in Spain's civil war. Earl Browder, former general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States, testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities that most of the members of the brigade were Communists. The *Daily Worker* for February 21, 1940, listed Albert Maltz as one of the signers of a protest to the President, which was sponsored by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. An advertisement sponsored by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and calling for a break in American relations with Spain, appeared both in the *Los Angeles Daily News* for May 10, 1945, and the *New York Times* for March 3, 1945, page 8. The advertisement listed Albert Maltz as one of the sponsors. Albert Maltz is also listed as a sponsor on a letterhead of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, dated December 28, 1946; the letter referred to announces the opening sale of tickets for a performance to be held at the Belasco Theater in New York on January 19, 1947, to raise funds for Republican Spain. A press release issued by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade in June 1947 and requesting United Nations action on Franco's regime in Spain is signed by a number of sponsors, including Albert Maltz.

38. A similar organization is the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, which was avowedly organized in July 1944, to fight for legislation ending American diplomatic relations with Spain and supplying American military aid for a Spanish revolution. Among the well known Communists in the leadership of the organization was Allan Chase, secretary, who is a former Communist Party political candidate. The organization has worked closely with the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. A letterhead of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, dated January 21, 1946, lists Albert Maltz as one of the organization's sponsors. In an undated letterhead of the Los Angeles chapter of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, put out in 1945, the name of Albert Maltz again appears.

39. The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, which has worked in cooperation with the Spanish-aid front organizations of the Communists, is engaged in providing transportation and support for international Communist agents such as Gerhart Eisler, who was recently convicted of passport fraud. The organization was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. It was also cited for contempt of Congress on April 16, 1946, and its leaders were convicted in a Federal court on June 27, 1947. The *Daily Worker* for August 12, 1943, sets forth the announcement from Dr. Edward A. Barsky, chairman of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, that a scroll of greetings to Spanish refugees freed from concentration camps in north Africa had been signed by 200 Americans. The list of names includes that of Albert Maltz. A letterhead, dated February 26, 1946, reflects that Albert Maltz served as a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal which was organized by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to further its purpose of aiding international Communist agents.

40. The American Committee for Yugoslav Relief is closely associated with the American Slav Congress, which was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on June 12, 1947. The American Committee for Yugoslav Relief is headed by Zlatko Balokovic, who is vice president of the American-Slav Congress, with headquarters in Moscow, and who lectured on the happiness of the Yugoslav people under communism after a trip to that country. An article in the *Downtown Shopping News* of Los Angeles for February 13, 1945, listed Albert Maltz as one of the sponsors of the Los Angeles American Committee for Yugoslav Relief.

41. The League of American Writers was an affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow, and the league was pledged to the defense of the Soviet Union and the use of "art as an instrument of the class struggle." The league was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Attorney General Biddle said that "the overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686). The league was founded at a Congress of American Revolutionary Writers held April 26 through

28, 1935, in New York City. The record shows that Albert Maltz was one of the founders of the League of American Writers.

(a) Albert Maltz was a member of the executive committee of the first writers' congress which resulted in the formation of the League of American Writers in 1935, according to the California Committee on Un-American Activities (1945 report, p. 126).

(b) The Bureau of Corporations, Department of State of New York, indicates that at the time of the formal incorporation of the League of American Writers on July 13, 1939, one of the original directors to act until the first annual meeting was Albert Maltz, whose address was given as 3905 Forty-fourth Street, Sunnyside, Long Island, N. Y.

(c) Albert Maltz presented a reading of *The Working Class Theatre* at the first writers' congress in 1935, according to the *Daily Worker* for April 29, 1935, pages 1 and 2.

(d) Albert Maltz was described as "among the most popular authors in the Soviet Union today" by the president of the League of American Writers at the opening of the Third American Writers Congress, according to volume 6, No. 1, of the league's organ, *The Bulletin*. Albert Maltz was one of the signers of the Call for the Third American Writers Congress which was held by the League of American Writers on June 2, 3, and 4, 1939, according to the magazine, *Direction*, for May-June, 1939, page 1. The official program of the Third Writers Congress showed that Mr. Maltz also served as cochairman of the arrangements committee on the drama.

(e) The *Daily Worker* for March 14, 1941, in an article headed "Writers' league plans summer conference," stated that the League of American Writers had completed plans for the first White Mountain Writers Conference, August 18 to September 2, at Jefferson, N. H., and that Albert Maltz would be included among the lecturers. The *New Masses* for April 8, 1941, page 26, carried the same information about Mr. Maltz.

(f) The *People's World*, official west coast Communist newspaper, on June 13, 1941, announced that Albert Maltz had been chosen vice president of the League of American Writers at the fourth congress of the organization, held in New York, June 6 through 8, 1941. Mr. Maltz was also listed as a vice president of the organization in *New Masses*, June 17, 1941, page 9; *Daily Worker*, September 14, 1942, page 7; and *People's World*, September 23, 1942, page 5. The writers' congress in June of 1941 adopted a firm antiwar stand, according to the *Daily Worker* for June 9, 1941. This was still during the period of the Stalin-Hitler pact, and part of the Communist Party line.

(g) The *People's World* for June 28, 1941, carried an article entitled, "Writers Hear Soviet War Against Nazis Lauded," which described the sixth semiannual meeting of the Hollywood branch of the League of American Writers. Albert Maltz and others made speeches lauding the Soviet Union. The Nazis had turned against Russia since the fourth writers' congress and the policies of the League of American Writers were switched accordingly. This is further borne out by the *Daily Worker* of July 24, 1941, which tells how the League of American Writers, of which Maltz is vice president, pledged "full aid to Britain and Soviet Union" and the *Daily Worker* of December 10, 1941, which tells how the league, in which Maltz is again listed as vice president, has offered the service of its members in the war against the Axis.

(h) The *People's World* for June 24, 1942, described a writers' workshop conference held by the League of American Writers. The article listed Albert Maltz as a sponsor of the conference and said resolutions adopted by the conference included support for the Communist Harry Bridges and a request for immediate opening of a second front in Europe.

(i) The *Daily Worker* for September 29, 1942, in an article entitled "Writers Defend Minority Rights," reports that the League of American Writers had made public a text of a telegram requesting a Democratic candidate for Governor in the State of New York to state his position on attacks by the American Legion on the electoral rights of the Communist Party. Albert Maltz' name is again carried as an officer of the league.

(j) Albert Maltz was listed as president of the west coast chapter of the League of American Writers in a pamphlet advertising courses for the fall term (1943) of the League of American Writers' School for Writers. Maltz wrote the foreword to the pamphlet.

(k) An undated bulletin of the League of American Writers listed Albert Maltz as a member of the national board of the organization.

(1) Albert Maltz himself, in testimony before the California Committee on Un-American Activities on October 13, 1944, admitted that he had been and still was national vice president of the League of American Writers, although the organization, he said, was not functioning at the time of his testimony. He also admitted that he was president of the Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers.

42. The Hollywood Writers Mobilization was the name given to the Hollywood League of American Writers after the League of American Writers could no longer conceal its Communist domination. The original pledge of the league to defend the Soviet Union and to use "art as an instrument of the class struggle" is now the basis upon which the policies of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization are founded. The issue of *Variety* for July 10, 1944, listed Albert Maltz as one of the speakers at a meeting of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, held July 7, 1944; at this meeting the Mobilization agreed to serve as a story department for the Overseas Film Branch of OWI. The *Guild Bulletin*, official organ of the Screen Writers Guild, in its issue No. 71, dated October 1, 1944, page 5, announced that Albert Maltz was one of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization members writing scripts for OWI. *Variety* for October 18, 1944, said that Albert Maltz would serve on a special research committee which the Hollywood Writers Mobilization was setting up to investigate whether the California Committee on Un-American Activities had ignored mandates of the legislature. Albert Maltz personally testified that he was a member of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization when he appeared before the California Committee on Un-American Activities on October 13, 1944.

43. The New Theatre was the official monthly magazine of the League of Workers Theatres, a section of the International Union of Revolutionary Theatre, with headquarters in Moscow. The league was used to present Communist propaganda plays and to raise funds for Communist purposes; it was succeeded in January 1935 by the New Theatre League, which had similar aims. The magazine, *New Theatre*, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. The *New Theatre League* was cited for its Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. In the January 1936 issue of *New Theatre*, the statement, "We are proud that among those who have associated themselves with us in the creation of the New Theatre are:" is followed by a list of names including that of Albert Maltz. The *New Theatre League*, in a press release dated November 8, 1935, stated that Albert Maltz had been awarded first place in a play contest for a one-act antiwar or "anti-Fascist" play, sponsored by the *New Theatre League* and the *American League Against War and Fascism* (which organization has been referred to above). Mr. Maltz' prize-winning play was entitled "Private Hicks." This play was praised in the *Daily Worker* for February 7, 1939, page 7, which stated that Private Hicks owed its start to the *New Theatre League*. The *Daily Worker* for January 8, 1936, page 3, reported that the *New Theatre League* was producing *The Black Pit*, written by Albert Maltz. The *New Theatre of Philadelphia*, in an announcement distributed by that organization during a Paul Robeson concert at the Philadelphia Academy of Music on March 7, 1941, stated that the theater organization would produce *Zero Hour*, written by Albert Maltz and George Sklar. The *Daily Worker* for June 10, 1938, page 7, listed Albert Maltz as a guest at a meeting of the *New Theatre League*. Mr. Maltz has contributed to *New Theatre* magazine, according to the issue for May 1935, page 8.

44. The Theatre Union was one of the affiliates of the League of Workers Theatres, which in turn was tied to the Moscow-directed International Union of the Revolutionary Theatre. Theatre Union reflected the current line of the Communist Party in its propaganda and was used to raise funds for Communist purposes. A leaflet of the organization listed Albert Maltz as a member of the executive board of the Theatre Union.

45. Frontier Films produced and distributed pro-Communist films, including a film on the Communist-led strike at the Allis-Chalmers plant in Milwaukee. The organization was headed by the following contributors to the Communist press: Kyle Crichton, alias Robert Forsythe; Irving Lerner; Clifford Odets; Edwin Rolfe, and George Seldes. It was cited for its Communist character by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. The *Daily Worker* for April 6, 1937, page 9, listed Albert Maltz as a staff member of Frontier Films.

46. Actors Laboratory was a training school for actors in Hollywood whose officers have lengthy records of Communist-front activity as evidenced in attached reports; such officers include Roman Bohnen, chairman; Larry Parks, treasurer; Morris Carnovsky, Jules Dassin, Edward Dmytryk, members of the executive board. The organization cooperated with the Hollywood Writers Mobilization which has been described above. The issue of *Variety* for August 16, 1944, carried an advertisement regarding the Actors Laboratory which was endorsed by 30 individuals, including Albert Maltz.

47. The Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions has been charged with being Communist dominated by Harold Ickes and other liberals who previously had supported it. It was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on September 2, 1947. A leaflet put out by the organization in 1945 listed Albert Maltz as one of the sponsors of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. *New Masses* for March 13, 1945, states that the magazine, *Independent*, is an organ of the Independent Citizens Committee and that Albert Maltz is one of the contributing editors to the publication.

48. The Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions split after Harold Ickes and other liberals condemned the organization as Communist-dominated. The pro-Communist section, after the split, formed the Progressive Citizens of America. The Progressive Citizens of America was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in a report of June 12, 1947. The *Daily Worker* for May 16, 1947, page 11, announced that the manuscript of Albert Maltz's novel, *The Cross and the Arrow*, would be auctioned off on May 18, 1947, at the Hotel Brevoort in New York City for the benefit of the literary division of the Progressive Citizens of America. The *Daily Worker* of July 5, 1947, page 11, published a photo of Albert Maltz with the announcement that Mr. Maltz would participate in a conference to be held July 9 through 13, 1947, in the Beverly Hills Hotel, Hollywood, under the auspices of the Hollywood Arts, Sciences, and Professions Council of the Progressive Citizens of America. The *Daily Worker* for July 31, 1947, page 11, reprinted part of a speech which the newspaper said Albert Maltz had given "recently" in Los Angeles at a meeting under the auspices of the Progressive Citizens of America.

49. The American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists, Inc., was a smaller, more specialized version of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which has been previously referred to. The American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists, Inc., was affiliated with the Jewish Anti-Fascist Committee of the Soviet Union and it also published a magazine, *New Currents*, which had the approval of the Jewish Commission of the Communist Party. The *People's World* for June 29, 1944, announced that a Hollywood chapter of the American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists was being organized and that Albert Maltz was among the members of the organizing committee. Albert Maltz was listed as a member of the advisory board of *New Currents*, in the December 1944 issue of the publication.

50. The Jewish People's Fraternal Order is an affiliate of the International Workers' Order, a Communist-front organization previously referred to. The Jewish People's Fraternal Order is headed by Albert E. Kahn, one of the leaders of the Communist Party in New York. The *People's World* for September 14, 1945, carried an advertisement announcing that a rally would be held on September 15, 1945, at the Embassy Auditorium in Los Angeles under the auspices of the Jewish People's Fraternal Order, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles. Albert Maltz was announced as one of the speakers. The *People's World* for September 5, 1947, page 5, listed Albert Maltz as one of the participants in a program sponsored by the Jewish People's Fraternal Order to be held September 7, 1947, at the Philharmonic Auditorium in Los Angeles.

51. The American Youth for Democracy is the official successor of the Young Communist League. It has been the subject of a report by the House Committee on Un-American Activities which described its character in detail. Its "sinister purposes" have been denounced by the director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (Congressional Record, Mar. 24, 1947, p. A1298). The *People's World* for December 1, 1944, reflects that Albert Maltz is a sponsor of the American Youth for Democracy. A letter of the organization announcing a meeting for October 21, 1945, in Los Angeles shows that Albert Maltz was one of the sponsors of the meeting. A leaflet announcing a dinner to be held under the auspices of the American Youth for Democracy on December 16, 1945, at the Ambassador

Hotel in Los Angeles records the name of Albert Maltz as a member of the dinner committee.

52. The National Committee Against Censorship of the Theater Arts was formed when the introduction of Communist propaganda themes in Federal theater projects aroused considerable public criticism and an investigation in Congress. The National Committee defended such Communist propaganda. Represented in the organization were the Communist Party and the International Labor Defense, the Communist Party's legal arm. Albert Maltz was a member of the National Committee Against Censorship of the Theater Arts, according to the pamphlet entitled, "Censored"

53. Book and Magazine Guild was a local of the Communist-dominated United Office and Professional Workers of America, operating in the book and magazine field. The Book and Magazine Guild interceded in behalf of Morris U. Schappes, an avowed Communist teacher convicted of perjury in New York, according to the Daily Worker for September 23, 1941, page 3. A pamphlet put out by the Book and Magazine Guild, 239 Fourth Avenue, New York City, dated winter 1940, and entitled, "Courses for Publishing Employees," listed a course, The Writer and Organization, given by Albert Maltz.

54. Albert Maltz is a member of the Screen Writers Guild, according to the sworn testimony of Emmett Lavery, guild president, before the California Committee on Un-American Activities (1947 report, p. 283). The Screen Writers Guild participated in the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, an organization previously referred to. John Howard Lawson, identified by the Daily Worker for August 23, 1937, page 7, as a Communist Party member, is a leading figure in the Screen Writers Guild.

55. The National Council for Public Morale was headed by Arthur Upham Pope, the official American biographer of the Soviet leader, Maxim Litvinoff; Pope also is the recipient of archeological concessions from the Soviet Union. The Washington Post for May 24, 1943, states that Arthur Upham Pope of the National Council for Public Morale had made public an open letter to the President requesting war on Finland. Albert Maltz was reported as one of the signers of the open letter.

56. The People's Institute of Applied Religion has been described by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist effort to gain a foothold in the South by exploiting the well-known religious attachments of that section of the country. The organization is headed by Claude C. Williams, who the Daily Worker has reported was discharged from the church on charges of communism in 1934. An undated letterhead of the People's Institute of Applied Religion, with headquarters in Birmingham, Ala., lists the name of Albert-Maltz among its sponsors.

57. The Daily Worker for August 25, 1947, page 11, described with acclaim the filming of the new movie, Naked City, at that time on location in New York City; the newspaper listed Albert Maltz as one of the writers of the screen play for the movie.

58. Albert Maltz' writings in the Daily Worker have also reflected his faithfulness to the Communist Party line. In the Daily Worker for December 16, 1933, page 7, Mr. Maltz and playwright George Sklar, with whom Mr. Maltz has collaborated in writing plays, are the joint authors of an article entitled "The Need for a Workers Theater." The article calls the existing Broadway theater "a sterile theater" and states:

"It's time we had a theater which will reflect the fact that we're living in a certain type of society, a society gripped by the most severe economic crisis that capitalism has known." The article pointed out that the professional bourgeois theater would become more and more a theater of escape as "the class struggle deepens." It then goes on to say: "This is not so in the Soviet Union. We see there an interest in the art of the theater such as the world has never known before. We see a theatrical center in every city, in every factory, in every village. Why? Because the Soviet theater is not a theater of the privileged class but the theater of a whole country, of a whole people. And it is a vital theater because it belongs to those who are building a new society and not to those who are clinging to a dead one. The future of the theater in America lies in the creation of a workers' theater."

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, the next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Alvah Bessie.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bessie, will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BESSIE. I do.

TESTIMONY OF ALVAH BESSIE

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

Mr. BESSIE. Mr. Chairman, I also have a statement I would like to read to this committee if you would like to examine it, or would you prefer to have me read it?

The CHAIRMAN. We will be pleased to examine it. First, I think Mr. Stripling ought to identify the witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Bessie, will you state your full name and present address for the record, please?

Mr. BESSIE. My name is Alvah Bessie and I live at 369 South Crescent Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Bessie?

Mr. BESSIE. I was born in New York City on June 4, 1904.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you here before the committee in response to a subpoena which was served upon you on September 18, calling for your appearance before the committee on October 23?

Mr. BESSIE. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you receive a telegram dated October 11, addressed to you, Mr. Alvah Bessie, 369 South Crescent Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif., which read as follows:

In response to the subpoena served upon you summoning you to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., on October 23, you are hereby directed to appear on October 27, instead of October 23, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., room 226, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Signed, "J. Parnell Thomas, chairman."

Mr. BESSIE. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are here in response to the subpoena and the summons——⁶¹

Mr. BESSIE. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. In the form of a telegram from the chairman?

Mr. BESSIE. I would like to ask about my statement at this point. May I be permitted to read the statement?

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Bessie; the committee is considering the statement.

Mr. KENNEY. Do you have a copy of it?

Mr. BESSIE. I have another copy of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bessie, while there is some doubt that your statement is pertinent to the inquiry, as will be very evident when you read it——

Mr. BESSIE. I would still like to have permission to read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. Nevertheless, the committee is willing that you read the statement. We are just wondering, in order to save time, if you couldn't read the first couple of paragraphs and then let us put it in the record at this point, just as we did with the record of Mr. Maltz.

Mr. BESSIE. In accordance with your request, I will read the first two paragraphs and the last two.

⁶¹ See appendix, p. 541, for exhibits 73 and 74.

The CHAIRMAN. That is fine. Thank you very much. Proceed.

Mr. BESSIE. It is my understanding of the first amendment to our Constitution that it expressly forbids Congress to pass any law which shall abridge freedom of speech or of opinion. And it is my understanding of the function of congressional committees that they are set up by the Congress for the express purpose of inquiring into matter that may lead to the initiation of legislation in the Congress.

Now either the Constitution and its Bill of Rights mean what they say or they do not mean what they say. Either the first amendment is binding upon Congress and all legislative bodies of our Government, or it means nothing at all. I cannot agree with this so-called committee in its implied belief that the Bill of Rights means whatever this body chooses it to mean, or is applicable only to those with whose opinions this committee is in agreement.

Those are the first two paragraphs. Now, the last two paragraphs.

In calling me from my home this body hopes also to rake over the smoldering embers of the war that was fought in Spain from 1938 to 1939. This body, in all its previous manifestations, is on record as believing that support of the Spanish Republic was and is subversive, un-American, and Communist-inspired. That lie was originally spawned by Hitler and Franco, and the majority of the American people—in fact, the majority of the people of the world—never believed it. And I want it on the record at this point that I not only supported the Spanish Republic but that it was my high privilege and the greatest honor I have ever enjoyed to have been a volunteer soldier in the ranks of its International Brigades throughout 1938. And I shall continue to support the Spanish Republic until the Spanish people in their majesty and power remove Francisco Franco and all his supporters and reestablish the legal government Franco and his Nazi and Italian Fascist soldiers overthrew.

The understanding that led me to fight in Spain for that republic, and my experience in that war, teach me that this committee is engaged in precisely the identical activities engaged in by un-Spanish committees, un-German committees, and un-Italian committees which preceded it in every country which eventually succumbed to fascism. I will never aid or abet such a committee in its patent attempt to foster the sort of intimidation and terror that is the inevitable precursor of a Fascist regime. And I therefore restate my conviction that this body has no legal authority to pry into the mind or activities of any American who believes, as I do, in the Constitution, and who is willing at any time to fight to preserve it—as I fought to preserve it in Spain.

The CHAIRMAN. And now, Mr. Bessie, in accordance with our agreement, the whole statement will be placed in the record.

Mr. BESSIE. Thank you.

(The statement is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF ALVAH BESSIE TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

It is my understanding of the first amendment to our Constitution that it expressly forbids Congress to pass any law which shall abridge freedom of speech or of opinion. And it is my understanding of the function of congressional committees that they are set up by the Congress for the express purpose of inquiring into matter that may lead to the initiation of legislation in the Congress.

Now either the Constitution and its Bill of Rights mean what they say or they do not mean what they say. Either the first amendment is binding upon Congress and all legislative bodies of our Government or it means nothing at all. I cannot agree with this so-called committee in its implied belief that the Bill of Rights means whatever this body chooses it to mean, or it is applicable only to those with whose opinions and activities this committee is in agreement.

I am not in agreement with the opinions, activities, or objectives of this committee or any committee remotely resembling it. And since the only legislation this committee could possibly initiate would automatically abridge freedom of speech and opinion, and would therefore be automatically unconstitutional, I have come to the conclusion, that will eventually be borne out by events, that this body is totally unconstitutional and without power to inquire into anything I think, believe, uphold, and cherish, or anything I have ever written or said, or any organization I have ever joined or failed to join.

As a one-time newspaperman I have been deeply interested in the mounting reaction of disapproval by the press of the Nation of the activities of this committee. When the conservative New York Herald Tribune can say " * * * the beliefs of men and women who write for the screen are, like the beliefs of any ordinary men or women, everybody's business but their own, as the Bill of Rights mentions. Neither Mr. Thomas nor the Congress in which he sits is empowered to dictate what Americans shall think * * *"; and when the Washington Post can state that this " * * * supercolossal Hollywood investigation is [intended] to intimidate and coerce the industry into an even more rigid acceptance of Mr. Thomas' concepts of Americanism * * *"; and when the Chicago Times can say, "Of course, the real object of Chairman Thomas and the reactionary Republican majority of the House Un-American Activities Committee is not primarily to uncover subversive influences in Hollywood. It is to smear New Dealers and whatever their progressive successors may be called * * *"—then it is not difficult for any intelligent person to realize that if this investigation is permitted to achieve its immediate objective, it will not hesitate to move on from the motion-picture industry it has emasculated, to the throttling of the press, the radio, the theater, and the book publishers of America. We saw this pattern at work before, in Hitler's Germany, and we understand it thoroughly. The true purpose of this Committee on Un-American Activities is to provide the atmosphere and to act as the spearhead for the really un-American forces preparing a Fascist America.

In calling me from my home this body hopes also to rake over the smoldering embers of the war that was fought in Spain in 1938 to 1939. This body in all its previous manifestations is on record as believing that support of the Spanish Republic was and is subversive, un-American, and Communist-inspired. That lie was originally spawned by Hitler and Franco, and the majority of the American people—in fact, the majority of the people of the world—never believed it. And I want it on the record at this point that I not only supported the Spanish Republic but that it was my high privilege and the greatest honor I have ever enjoyed to have been a volunteer soldier in the ranks of its International Brigades throughout 1938. And I shall continue to support the Spanish Republic until the Spanish people in the majesty and power remove Francisco Franco and all his supporters and reestablish the legal government Franco and his Nazi and Italian Fascist soldiers overthrew.

The understanding that led me to fight in Spain for that republic, and my experience in that war, teach me that this committee is engaged in precisely the identical activities engaged in by un-Spanish committees, un-German committees, and un-Italian committees which preceded it in every country which eventually succumbed to fascism. I will never aid or abet such a committee in its patent attempt to foster the sort of intimidation and terror that is the inevitable precursor of a Fascist regime. And I therefore restate my conviction that this body has no legal authority to pry into the mind or activities of any American who believes, as I do, in the Constitution, and who is willing at any time to fight to preserve it—as I fought to preserve it in Spain.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Bessie, I am going to address certain questions to you and I hope you will give me a responsive answer.

MR. BESSIE. I will do my best.

MR. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

MR. BESSIE. I am a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever been employed in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. BESSIE. I have been employed on and off in the motion-picture industry since January 1943.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BESSIE. This is the same sort of a question that was asked of other witnesses. It involves a question of my association.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. BESSIE. I have not refused to answer the question, but I must answer the question in the only way in which I know how, and that is, that I believe that such a question violates my right of association and is not properly falling—I do not believe it falls properly within the scope of this committee's inquiry.

Mr. STRIPLING. We will move on to the \$64 question, Mr. Bessie.

Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BESSIE. Mr. Stripling and gentlemen of the committee, unless it has been changed since yesterday in our country, we have a secret ballot; and I do not believe this committee has any more right to inquire into my political affiliations than I believe an election official has the right to go into the voting booth and examine the ballot which has been marked by the voter. General Eisenhower himself has refused to reveal his political affiliations, and what is good enough for General Eisenhower is good enough for me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Bessie, this committee has officially found that the Communist Party in the United States is not a political party but is, in fact, the agent of a foreign government. I will ask you again: Are you now, or have you ever been, a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BESSIE. Mr. Stripling, if you did not understand the answer to my question—

Mr. STRIPLING. I understood your answer.

Mr. BESSIE. I suggest you have the secretary read it back to you.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Bessie, there have been charges made before this committee that you are a Communist. I didn't notice anywhere in your statement that you denied that charge. You are now being given an opportunity to deny whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party. You have not answered whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. BESSIE. In the statement which you were kind enough to permit me to read, I stated I stand on the Bill of Rights on this issue; and I think either the Bill of Rights means something or it doesn't; and if it doesn't mean anything, it is news to me, and I think it would be great news to the majority of the American people.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to direct the witness to answer the question whether or not he is now or has ever been a member of the Communist Party, which is the essence of this entire matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Bessie, in order to save a lot of time, we would like to know whether you are or have ever been a member of the Communist Party. We would like a very frank answer. You can answer it "yes" or "no"; or if you don't care to answer it, just say so.

Mr. BESSIE. Mr. Thomas, with whatever respect is due this committee, I now state I have given you my answer to this question. I have not attempted to evade the question. I have given you the

answer to the questions, according to my understanding of what protections are offered the American people, and I object violently to the procedure this committee engages in, in an attempt to make people state what they think, believe, with whom they associate, whom they go to dinner with, or what have you.

The CHAIRMAN. The only part of your answer I can remember is that part about General Eisenhower; and I don't think that is a——

Mr. BESSIE. May I ask if you would have General Eisenhower here and ask him——

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

Mr. BESSIE. And ask him whether he is a member of the Republican or Democratic Party.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think that was a responsive answer to the question. What we are attempting to do—what this committee of Congress is attempting to do—is to ascertain the extent of Communist infiltration in the moving-picture industry.

Mr. BESSIE. I don't believe that that is what this committee is trying to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute——

Mr. BESSIE. I believe what this committee is trying to do——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. BESSIE. Is to do exactly the same thing——

The CHAIRMAN. I am telling you what the committee is trying to do. We know exactly what the committee is trying to do.

Mr. BESSIE. I have my own opinion of it.

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right; you can have any opinion you want.

Mr. BESSIE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee would like to know now whether you have ever been a member of the Communist Party or whether you are a member of the Communist Party now?

Mr. BESSIE. I have given you several answers to that question, and that is the best I can do for you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do you——

Mr. BESSIE. Because I believe you are violating my rights as an American citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. So you refuse?

Mr. BESSIE. I am not refusing. I have told you that is the answer I have given you. The answer is now recorded several times. I don't believe you have the right to ask this question of anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very apparent you are following the same line of these other witnesses.

Mr. BESSIE. I am following no line——

The CHAIRMAN (continuing). Which is definitely the Communist line.

Mr. BESSIE. I am using my own head, which I am privileged to do.

The CHAIRMAN. You are excused. If you want to make a speech, go out here under a big tree.

Mr. BESSIE. Thank you. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). May we have order, please.

Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. Stripling, before you start, I just want to make one observation for the committee. I am very definite in this, to. It is my

belief that if General Eisenhower were a witness before this committee and he was asked the question, "Are you a member of the Communist Party?" he would not only be very responsive to the question, but he would be absolutely insulted, and solely for this reason: A great man like General Eisenhower would not ever think or dream or stoop to ever being a low-down Communist. Go ahead. [Loud applause.]

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, again I will ask Mr. Russell to take the stand.

Mr. Russell, you have been sworn and you have been identified as an investigator for this committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you detailed to make an investigation to determine whether or not Alvah Bessie was ever at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. What did your investigation disclose?

Mr. RUSSELL. During the course of my investigation I secured information relating to the registration card of Alvah Bessie in the Communist Party of the United States. I have a photostatic copy of the registration card of Alvah Bessie in the Communist Party of the United States, which bears the number "47279" and which contains the notation, "1944, card No. 46836."

It contains the name "Alvah Bessie." His address is given as "4653 Coldwater Canyon; city, Hollywood; county, Los Angeles; State, California."

It contains a notation, "New card issued on December 10, 1944." The description of Alvah Bessie is given as follows: "Male; white; occupation, writer; industry, motion pictures." The question is then asked: "Member of CIO, A. F. of L., independent union, or no union?" "Independent union" is checked.

The question on the bottom of the card, "Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker?" Above that notation "Daily Worker" there is contained in ink the notation, "P. W.," meaning the "Peoples World." The answer "Yes" is checked.⁶²

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

Mr. Chairman, we have here a memorandum prepared by the investigative and research staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities dealing with the Communist affiliations of Alvah Bessie. It is contained on 7 pages and lists 32 separate affiliations.

With the Chair's permission, I will ask Mr. Mandel, director of research, to read this memorandum. Is that agreeable to the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANDEL (reading):

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, ON THE COMMUNIST AFFILIATIONS OF ALVAH BESSIE

According to the Motion Picture Almanac, Alvah Bessie is credited with the writing of the following motion pictures: Northern Pursuit, Warner Bros., 1943;

⁶² See appendix, p. 541., for exhibit 75.

The Very Thought of You, Warner Bros., 1944; Hotel Berlin, Warner Bros., 1945; and Objective Burma, Warner Bros., 1945.

1. According to the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Alvah Bessie is one of the leading contributors to the Communist publications in the United States.

He has been connected with New Masses, a weekly publication of the Communist Party, as contributing editor, since 1937. During this period he has contributed over 85 articles. As a standard Communist rule, such officials of the Communist press are required to be members of the party.

2. The People's World of October 11, 1939, which is the official Communist organ of the west coast of the United States, devotes an article in praise of the writings of Alvah Bessie. The People's World of August 26, 1943, lists Alvah Bessie as a speaker at a benefit given under the auspices of People's World.

3. In the September 22, 1942, issue of the Weekly Review, a publication of the Young Communist League, Alvah Bessie is listed as an instructor at the Workers School in New York City. The Workers School was established by the Communist Party of the United States. Alvah Bessie has also been an instructor at the People's Educational Center (People's World, January 11, 1944, p. 5).

4. Alvah Bessie, according to the November 16, 1943, issue of People's World, was a speaker at a West Side Los Angeles rally sponsored by the International Workers Order. The International Workers Order, a Communist-front organization, has been cited as such by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1943, and May 29, 1946.

In addition to this citation, it was cited by the House Committee on Appropriations, in a report dated April 21, 1943, and by special legislative committees of the States of Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, and California.

Former Attorney General Francis Biddle, in his listing of Communist-front organizations, which appeared in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1943, characterized the International Workers Order as "one of the strongest Communist organizations." The People's World of November 10, 1942, lists Alvah Bessie as the coauthor of a pamphlet issued by the International Workers Order in connection with its front-line fighter's campaign.

5. Alvah Bessie was a contributor to the July and September 1937 and January 1938 issues of the magazine Fight, which magazine was the official publication of the American League Against War and Fascism. The American League Against War and Fascism was active in the period 1932 to 1937 in behalf of the Soviet foreign policy. It proclaimed an openly treasonable program.

It was cited as subversive by the Special Committee on un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, March 29, 1944, and May 29, 1946. Former Attorney General Francis Biddle cited this organization as established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union.

6. Alvah Bessie was also the sponsor of the organization known as the Artists' Front to Win the War (the official program, October 16, 1942). While in 1942 all Americans were interested in winning the war, the Artists' Front to Win the War echoed the demand of the Communist Party of the United States for the express purpose of placing pressure upon the military leaders in this country by a demand for an immediate opening of a second front in Europe at a time when Russia was suffering military reversals. The Artists' Front to Win the War was sponsored by the same persons who, during the Stalin-Hitler pact, were referring to the United States as a war-mongering nation and demanding the discontinuance of America's lease-lend program, which was designed to aid Great Britain in its struggle against Nazi Germany.

7. Alvah Bessie was a sponsor and consistent supporter of the League of American Writers (New Masses, April 22, 1941, and June 17, 1941; Daily Worker, September 14, 1942; and People's World, September 23, 1942). The League of American Writers, which was an affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow, was pledged to the defense of the Soviet Union and "use of art as an instrument of the class struggle." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities has cited this organization as a Communist front in reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Former Attorney General Francis Biddle in his characterization of this organization stated "the overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686).

8. Alvah Bessie has openly avowed himself in support of the Soviet Union. He has also contributed articles to the magazine Soviet Russia Today, which

magazine is devoted to the interests of the Soviet Union (September 1937, p. 6; October 1941, p. 30; January 1942, p. 29; and February 1942, p. 29).

9. Earl Browder, former head of the Communist Party of the United States, in testifying before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, stated that the Communist Party formed certain of its members—certain of its members—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Mandel, how far have you gone now?

Mr. MANDEL. I am now on point 9 and there are 32 points in all. I am on page 2 and there are seven pages in all.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, the Chair will rule that further reading be dispensed with and the material consisting of 5 more pages and 37 citations be placed in the record at this point.

(The material referred to above is as follows:)

into a fighting force known as the Abraham Lincoln Brigade for participation in the Spanish force known as the Abraham Lincoln Brigade for participation in the Spanish Civil War. This effort was initiated at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in the summer of 1935. Alvah Bessie was a staff officer of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and fought in Spain as an ally of other Communist units which were supporting the loyalist cause (People's World of December 30, 1942; files of the Committee on Un-American Activities).

10. Alvah Bessie was a member of the advisory board of the periodical New Currents (March 1944) and a member of the editorial staff of the publication Mainstream (winter 1947). Both these publications were organized by leading Communists and supported by the Communist press.

11. The Daily Worker for December 12, 1938, carries an article entitled "Unions Will Form Guard of Honor" concerning the arrival of 150 veterans of the Lincoln Brigade. Alvah Bessie was listed as a commissar in the returning group.

The Daily Worker for December 14, 1938 also carries an article concerning the returning veterans of the Lincoln Brigade entitled "Huge Parade Will Greet Boys at Ship." Returning veterans are listed according to State, and the name Alvah Bessie is listed under the State of New York.

12. The Daily Worker for January 11, 1941 carries an article on page 7 entitled "Bells Toll for Hemingway at Vets' Symposium." This article stated that a number of the veterans of the Spanish Civil War, being angered at the picture of the Spanish Civil War presented by Ernest Hemingway in his latest book, For Whom the Bell Tolls, had announced their intention of speaking from the floor at a symposium of the book which was to be held at 50 East Thirteenth Street (the headquarters of the Communist Party U. S. A.) under the auspices of the Workers School. Alvah Bessie, sergeant adjutant of the Lincoln Battalion and well-known short-story writer and novelist was listed as one of the speakers.

13. A leaflet which was distributed in the Los Angeles area disclosed that a meeting sponsored by the American Committee for Spanish Freedom and by the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade was to be held at the Embassy Auditorium, 843 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif. On June 10, 1946, Alvah Bessie undertook to act as chairman of this meeting, introducing first Russell Nixon, described as a former professor of Harvard University and an economist of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO, a Communist-controlled union.

14. The Daily Worker for September 29, 1946, on page 3 carries a photograph of Gen. Karol Swierczewski, of Soviet-controlled Poland, pictured with Americans whom he decorated with the Dombrowski Medal at the national convention of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. Bart van der Schelling accepted the award for Alvah Bessie.

15. The publication Volunteer for Liberty for November 1946 in reporting the election of officers of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade listed Alvah Bessie as a member of the national executive board.

16. Alvah Bessie was listed as a sponsor for a theatrical program to be held January 19, 1947, at the Valeska Theater, New York, entitled "Stars Entertain for Republican Spain." The program was arranged for the benefit of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

17. On April 12, 1944, a mass meeting was held at the Philharmonic Auditorium at Los Angeles for the benefit of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. This committee has furnished transportation and support for international Communist agents like Gerhardt Eisler.

It has been cited for contempt of Congress. Alvah Bessie took part in this meeting and made an eloquent plea for money, stating that \$560,000 was needed to carry out the program of relief undertaken by the committee. He stated that a \$60,000 hospital was to be built in Mexico and that the money was to be used to take care of Loyalists wherever they might be. During the taking of the collection, Bessie took off his necktie and said he would auction it off to the highest bidder. He stated that the tie had a history, that when he was in Spain in 1937 and 1938 with the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, he had purchased the tie at Barcelona, Spain.

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, together with the Council on African Affairs, held a dinner at the Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif., February 4, 1945. Alvah Bessie attended this meeting and introduced the featured speaker of the evening, Paul Robeson, who is devout Soviet apologist.

Virginia Wright in her column in the Los Angeles Daily News, June 11, 1945, stated that Alvah Bessie, Warner Bros. screen writer, would be the principal speaker Saturday night in the garden cabaret to be held for the benefit of the Spanish maquis at 636 R. Reese Place, Burbank. This article stated that: "Some 50,000 Spanish maquis, remnants of the men who fought for the Spanish Republic then joined with the United Nations in liberating France, are now destitute in Europe.

"It is of these Alvah Bessie speaks with knowledge. He was one of the groups of Americans who fought in Spain as part of the famous Lincoln Brigade."

It was further indicated that the program was planned by the Burbank chapter of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.

18. The Daily Worker for September 27, 1942, published a class schedule for the Workers School, 35 East Twelfth Street, New York City. This was at the time the official school of Communist Party conducted at party headquarters. Alvah Bessie is listed as teaching a course "Literature and the world we live in."

On page 17 of a booklet entitled "Workers School" announcing courses for the winter term, 1943, Alvah Cecil Bessie was listed as lecturing on literature and the world we live in, which is stated to be a course of 12 lectures (and discussions) that will attempt to relate the world in which we live to some outstanding achievements of literary art of our time. The announcement states that leading dramatic writers (Steinbeck, Smolokov, Richard Wright, Lillian Hellman, Clifford Odets, and others) will be used as a point of departure for discussions of the history of social institutions as they have been reflected by the writers of all times.

19. The School for Writers, 1717 North Vine Street, Hollywood, Calif., which was sponsored by the League of American Writers, in a prospectus for the summer term of 1943 shows Alvah Bessie as teaching a course in short stories. The notes on the faculty on the back of this prospectus carries the following information concerning Bessie:

20. A letterhead on recent literature put out by the American-Russian Institute of Southern California lists Alvah Bessie as being on the board of directors. This organization has conducted active pro-Soviet propaganda.

21. In a pamphlet entitled "Informed Speakers Offer You Facts on the U. S. S. R." there appeared the following information:

"The American Council on Soviet Relations has a speakers' bureau to supply just such information. We can provide your organization with speakers who by study or by personal experience know the Soviet Union."

Alvah Bessie was listed as an available speaker.

A 10-cent pamphlet by Alvah Bessie, *The Soviet People at War*, was published by the American Council on Soviet Relations, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York. This organization has been cited as a Communist party by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and by the Committee for Cultural Freedom, headed by John Dewey in April 1940.

A pamphlet entitled "Hear About the U. S. S. R." was published by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. This pamphlet explains the speakers' bureau of the organization and is addressed particularly to organizations who might be interested in securing a speaker on various Russian topics. Alvah Bessie, author of *Men in Battle*, was listed as an available speaker.

22. The Daily Worker for December 29, 1942, carries an article captioned "Allied notables hail IWO booklet on war." The article states that numerous acknowledgments from prominent leaders in all walks of life were putting into the International Workers Order offices in New York City on receipt of a fraternal de luxe limited edition of *This Is Your Enemy*, written by Alvah Bessie, American novelist.

The International Workers Order arranged a symposium for November 22, 1943, to be held at the Studio Carpenters Hall, 5164 Santa Monica Boulevard,

Los Angeles, Calif. Approximately 530 people attended instant meeting. Alvah Bessie spoke.

The People's World newspaper for March 17, 1945, reports that Alvah Bessie would speak on the last line in the Axis chain on Monday, March 19, 1945, at the Screen Cartoonist Guild, 6272 Yucca, Hollywood. According to the announcement, admission would be free and refreshments would be served under the auspices of lodge 469 of the International Workers Order.

23. The Daily People's World for November 13, 1945, in a write-up on a meeting sponsored by the American Committee for Spanish Freedom, relative to a "Break relations with Spain rally" to be held at the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles, November 16, 1945, stated that a number of Hollywood personages would participate in the evening event with the script for the skit being provided by Alvah Bessie. Alvah Bessie's name appears on the letterhead of the American Committee for Spanish Freedom as a sponsor. This organization was part of the Communist campaign in behalf of Soviet policy in the Spanish Civil War.

25. On December 16, 1945, a "welcome home, Joe" dinner was given as a "tribute to America's young fighting men and women on the occasion of the second anniversary of American Youth for Democracy." This organization was formerly known as the Young Communist League. This information appeared on a copy of the program of the dinner. Alvah Bessie's name appeared on the program along with the names of John Howard Lawson and Paul Robeson.

26. The Chicago Herald-Tribune for June 9, 1941, reflects that Alvah Bessie was elected a member of the national executive board of the Fourth American Writers Congress.

Sender Garlin, in the Daily Worker for June 11, 1941, in commenting on the Fourth American Writers Congress stated that: "Alvah Bessie, veteran of the Spanish War, spoke on the writers and the struggle of fascism in Spain. He told not only of the men who fought for Spain but of those literary mercenaries who betrayed Spain's cause and the cause of mankind when Spain was temporarily defeated * * *"

On November 12, 1943, the forum of the League of American Writers presented the subject "This Is Treason," a forum on Hitler's secret weapon. The proceeds of this forum were to go to an organization known as Sleepy Lagoon Defense Committee, an affiliate of the International Labor Defense cited by Attorney General Biddle as the "legal arm of the Communist Party."

At this forum Alvah Bessie read a paper by Dr. Harry Hoijer, reviewing Allen Chase's book Falange. Prior to the reading of the paper Bessie stated that the Fascists of Germany and Italy really instigated the so-called Spanish Civil War and were aided by the United States through its neutrality laws as well as the appeasement policy of Great Britain and France. He said the appeasement policy gave the Japs time to prepare and also permitted them to buy more scrap to wage war ultimately against the Allies.

In 1944 Alvah Bessie was listed as being on the national board of the League of American Writers.

27. The magazine New Currents in its December 1944 and January 1945 issue lists Alvah Bessie as a member of the advisory board. This magazine is a publication of the American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists, Inc. The writers for this magazine have included those who have contributed to the Communist and Soviet press.

28. The Independent Citizens Committee of the Artists, Scientists, and Professions, Inc., publishes a monthly journal of opinion, the Independent, which is sent to all members and to more than 100 daily and weekly newspapers throughout the country. Alvah Bessie is listed as one of the contributing editors to this publication. This organization has been repudiated by Harold L. Ickes and other liberals as Communist-dominated.

29. The Daily Worker for September 22, 1946, published photographs of Alvah Bessie and others who were to be connected with a new magazine, Mainstream. Bessie was indicated to be on the editorial board. Mainstream was described as a Marxist literary magazine, aiming to advance a people's working-class literature in America. It was stated that the magazine would strive "to stimulate and guide Marxist thinking in literature."

A brochure advertising this magazine states "the fundamental character of this magazine is determined by its allegiance to the Marxist science of history, culture, and human progress. * * *" The brochure states: "We call upon writers to fight anti-Communist influences in writing today, we fight the literary anti-Sovieters who constitute an auxiliary legion of the war makers."

30. The Daily Worker for April 13, 1940, carried an article captioned "Philadelphia anti-Dies rally to hear noted authors." The article states that noted

authors would speak at a big mass meeting in Town Hall, 150 Broad Street, on the following night, in a protest against the Dies committee unconstitutional raids on the seizure of material from Communist Party and IWO offices there. The speakers included Ruth McKenney, William Blake, Alvah Bessie, Mark Blitzstein, Bruce Minton, and others. The meeting was to be under the auspices of the People's Forum, with the New Masses participating.

Alvah Bessie, writer, New York, N. Y., appeared on a list captioned "I hereby join in signing the January 1943 'Message to the House of Representatives' opposing renewal of the Dies committee. Copies of this list were transmitted to Members of Congress by the National Federation of Constitutional Liberties, 1123 Broadway, room 907, New York, N. Y."

31. The Daily Worker for February 18, 1942, carried an article concerning the individuals interested in the immediate release of Earl Browder. Alvah Bessie is listed with many others by the Citizens Committee as having communicated with the Chief Executive of the Nation on the Browder case, calling upon him "to correct his injustice by an act of Executive clemency."

32. Page 3 of the Daily People's World for April 19, 1946, carries an article entitled "Forum Tonight To Hear Report on Peace Meet." It was stated that a report on the Win-the-Peace Conference, by William Pomerance, executive secretary, Screen Writers Guild, would highlight the Hollywood Forum on the following night at the Allan Rudack Studio, 7312 Beverly Boulevard. Waldo Salt was to be moderator of the forum, and Alvah Bessie was included among the speakers. The Win-the-Peace Conference is the most recent version of the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House during the Stalin-Hitler pact.

The CHAIRMAN. Before we call another witness, the Chair would like to say that we have had four very prominent writers before us—writers who have worked in almost every field, writers who have written many of the scripts in very prominent moving pictures. It is very evident from the manner in which these writers responded to the questions that they didn't want to answer the questions.

It is very evident from the material presented by our investigative staff and the research staff that these four men have extensive Communist and Communist front records. Yet, this kind of people are writing scripts in the moving-picture industry.

There will be more witnesses to come who will probably all carry out the same line. The Chair would like to point out that this is one of the reasons why this committee is investigating communism in the moving-picture industry, and it is just definite proof that there is a real reason for the investigation before these hearings.

So, when any person—it makes no difference whether he is in the industry or out of the industry—says that we are persecuting these people, says that we are making a witch hunt, says that we are looking into something we have no business to look into, that to me is just plain foolishness.

I don't think this committee has ever looked into anything where we have found more evidence of Communist activities than we have found in Hollywood. So this committee is going to continue the probe—is going to continue the hearings; we are going to do everything we possibly can to spotlight these people just like we spotlighted Fritz Kuhn or Pelley or Gerhart Eisler or Hanns Eisler, Josephson, Eugene Dennis, and anyone else whom we find has a Communist record. It will be beneficial to the American people and it will be beneficial to the industry itself, because you are the people—you persons high up in the industry can do more to clean your own house than can anybody else, but you must have the will, and we hope that by spotlighting these Communists you will acquire that will.

Put on the next witness, Mr. Stripling. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDowell. Before the next witness goes on, I would like to read a telegram just received by the Committee on Un-American Activities here from a well-known and veteran figure in Hollywood, and particularly well known to the American people. I do not applaud the language used here. Nevertheless, I will read the telegram:

The UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your splendid courage. Communist rattlesnakes are bent on inoculating the mind of our American youth. Clean out the rats. You are not injuring our industry. You are helping to keep them American. Bless you.

LEO CARRILLO.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would also like to make this statement: Because of the failure of Mr. Maltz and Mr. Bessie to respond to questions propounded of them, this subcommittee, by a unanimous vote, recommends to the full committee that Albert Maltz and Alvah Bessie be cited for contempt.

Next witness.

Mr. GASTON. Will Mr. Brewer resume the stand, please?

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Brewer has requested the privilege of placing into the record many statements to substantiate some of the remarks he made this morning. He does not want to be left without having that placed in the record. Would that be agreeable to you, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Are these statements all pertinent to the inquiry?

TESTIMONY OF MR. ROY M. BREWER—Resumed

Mr. BREWER. Everything that I want to put in, Mr. Chairman, is. What I would like to say is this: In my testimony this morning I made certain statements which I have the proof to back up. In the line of questioning as it was developed, in order to answer a subsequent question, I was required to deviate from entering that proof. I particularly want to clear up a couple of points so that I cannot be accused of making statements that cannot be substantiated.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brewer, if you will submit those to the committee investigators and they pass their inspection, so ordered.

Mr. BREWER. Thank you.

Mr. GASTON. Mr. Brewer, this morning in your testimony you mentioned the National Labor Relations Board. Do you have any evidence or knowledge of any communistic influence over this National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. BREWER. There was considerable evidence on that in the various—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. You mean in regard to the strikes which you said were Communist-inspired out there? You are referring to just that?

Mr. GASTON. That is correct.

Mr. BREWER. The evidence which I have, Mr. Chairman, goes to the whole effort on the part of this Communist group, including the Kibre group, which was definitely identified as being Communist in their efforts to penetrate and control the studio unions.

The first evidence of this came at the time when an election was held in 1939 as the result of a petition from an organization known as the United Studio Technicians Guild. That was an organization founded and built around Jeff Kibre. Presumably it was an indepen-

dent organization, but the records which I read this morning proved that it was directed both by the State organization of the CIO and the Communist Party.

Now, the field examiner in charge of the election which handled the petition which this organization filed was a man by the name of William Pomerance. He was the official representative of the Government in their efforts to determine the representation in this case. William Pomerance later was identified as an active member in pro-Communist labor activities. He was the man who founded and organized the Screen Cartoonists' Guild, which was stated by Mr. Kibre as having been organized "by our people."

After he left the Screen Cartoonists' Guild he went to the Screen Writers' Guild and until only recently served as the executive secretary of the Screen Writers' Guild.

Another man that was employed by the National Labor Relations Board at the time of the 1939 election was a man by the name of Maurice Howard. Maurice Howard is at the present time the secretary of the Screen Cartoonists' Guild. He is a teacher at the People's Educational Center and has an impressive record of activities in various Communist and pro-Communist activities. In addition to that, he has been a leader in the activities of the pro-Communist group in the Central Labor Council of Los Angeles and in the various activities of the Conference of Studio Unions.

He was a member of the board of strategy of the Conference of Studio Unions in the prosecution of the strikes.

There is another person by the name of Frances Millington who was an employee of the National Labor Relations Board. Miss Millington is now an officer of the Screen Analysts' Guild in Hollywood.

There is another person by the name of William Esteman who until a short time ago was the attorney for the National Labor Relations Board in the Los Angeles office. Mr. Esteman has been, and as far as I know is now, the attorney for the Conference of Studio Unions and is also listed—and it was testified by Mr. Carlson—as a teacher in the People's Educational Center.

The presence of these persons in official capacities on the National Labor Relations Board had let us to believe, and I think rightly, that in many cases our interests were prejudiced. At any rate, we felt that there should have been no election in 1939.

We had contracts. There was no necessity for it, and in the reports which Mr. Kibre wrote he changed his entire strategy in his attempts to capture the unions as a result of the ruling which the National Labor Relations Board made in giving them an election and granting their petition.

Another activity which leads us to believe there was Communist influence in the National Labor Relations Board in Los Angeles was the efforts which were made by the Communists to capture the extras. The extras group had been a part of the Screen Actors' Guild. There was some dissatisfaction among extras. Their employment is of such a nature that it is not very steady, and so agitation started within the extras' group for a separate organization.

They went to the National Labor Relations Board. The National Labor Relations Board granted them an election. An election was held, and they voted to pull away from the Screen Actors' Guild.

A part of the campaign which they carried on was to the effect that if they did vote to disaffiliate with the Screen Actors' Guild they would then be given a charter from the American Federation of Labor. Well, the actors took a pretty strong position about a painters' union giving a charter to the extras, and they did not get a charter from any other A. F. of L. union, with the result that the National Labor Relations Board, which is supposed to facilitate the processes of collective bargaining, through their action in the extras' case, actually stopped the processes of collective bargaining for a period of 18 months for the extras, because it was not until after a second election had been held and the extras then voted to go back in association with the actors' group that they got a contract and the processes of collective bargaining were reestablished.

Another instance which happened was in this most recent strike. We had a Communist faction in one of our important locals led by a man by the name of Henschel. I believe that is spelled H-e-n-s-c-h-e-l. This man attempted to lead a revolt in our organization at the time of the strike, the first strike in 1945.

Incidentally, there is a very interesting history of Mr. Henschel's activity in the Communist Party contained in the reports which Mr. Kibre wrote to Roy Hudson in New York.

MR. GASTON. Mr. Brewer, who is Roy Hudson?

MR. BREWER. Roy Hudson is the trade-union secretary of the Communist Party and was at that time the labor editor of the Daily Worker.

Mr. Henschel was sent by the Communist Party to our 1938 convention in Cleveland, Ohio, for the purpose of attempting to push through a pro-Communist resolution. He made such a bad job of it—

MR. GASTON. Mr. Brewer, may I interrupt you a minute, please? For the purpose of the record, Mr. Roy Hudson is a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party Trade Union, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and, as you said, labor editor of the Daily Worker. That is for the purpose of identifying Mr. Hudson.

MR. McDOWELL. Further for the purpose of identifying Roy Hudson, he was unhorsed from considerable of those jobs and is now working The Vineyard in Pittsburgh, Pa.

MR. BREWER. Thank you.

MR. McDOWELL. Go ahead.

MR. BREWER. Mr. Henschel was sent, as I said, to our 1938 convention for the purpose of shoving through or attempting to shove through a resolution which the party wanted to pass. He made such a bad job of it that the then acting secretary of the Communist Party in Ohio, Mr. Max Weiss, wrote a complaint to Mr. Roy Hudson complaining about the activities of Mr. Henschel and complaining against the party officials in California who sent him to the convention so inadequately prepared to carry out his mission, with the result that the complaint was handed back and Mr. Kibre was instructed to investigate whether or not Mr. Henschel was a loyal comrade and a loyal party member, or whether he had just failed in his obligation. The report which Mr. Kibre printed in that respect is contained in these proceedings, which I would be glad to submit to the committee for the record.

Mr. Kibre stated in this report that at that time, which was 1939, or thereabouts, Mr. Henschel had been a party member for approximately 3 years' standing, a loyal party member, as Mr. Kibre described him.

Now this man Henschel showed up, as I said, in 1945, as the leader of a faction which was trying to embarrass our international union in its efforts to ward off this attempt of the conference of studio unions to capture our organization in Hollywood.

He organized a rank-and-file committee in almost exactly the same manner as was demonstrated by Mr. Kibre in his description of their efforts in 1939, and as a result of that he was discharged from his employment by Warner Bros. and he was expelled from the union, from our international union.

He went down to the National Labor Relations Board and filed a complaint. The complaint was investigated by a man by the name of Cameron. Now, we felt that we knew the law fairly well and we did not feel that Mr. Henschel had any real case at all. He had violated the rules of our union and we had expelled him and he was eligible to expulsion by any rule of the game.

I might say that as a result of the Communist tactics our efforts to conduct a trial were impeded to the extent that in order to insure the trial would be fair and to be sure the record would be clear, we spent some \$5,000 for the transcript alone in the trial which we held.

MR. GASTON. Mr. Brewer, were any of your local unions ever taken over by the Communists?

MR. BREWER. Yes; they were, but that is another story and if I might be permitted to continue this one I think it is important.

THE CHAIRMAN. I want to say, Mr. Brewer, we would like to continue with you on the stand for some time but we have a heavy schedule of witnesses. We are getting further behind all the time. Something that has arisen that will compel us to recess today at 4 o'clock so we haven't got much more time.

MR. BREWER. I will complete this very briefly then. To follow through briefly and conclude this Henschel matter, the matter was heard by the National Labor Relations Board and a decision was handed down. We felt that the examiner which was sent out seemed to be fair but the decision which he rendered was such a distortion of the law that we were at a loss to understand it.

After the decision was handed down we began to investigate the activities of the examiner that heard the case. The examiner's name was a Mr. Mortimer Reamer. We found much to our surprise that Mr. Mortimer Reamer—

THE CHAIRMAN. May we have order, please? I would like to suggest to our visitors if they can remain for a few more minutes it will help to maintain order. Go ahead.

MR. BREWER. This Mortimer Reamer had been the secretary of the National Lawyers' Guild, an organization which had been described as a Communist front for lawyers and an organization in which Mr. Robert W. Kenny was the national chairman, and at that time, I might say, Mr. Robert W. Kenny had been active in organizations that were openly opposing us and aiding our enemies in this fight.

So, we felt, we could not help but feel after reviewing the entire case that there had been a number of instances where the Communist influences had influenced the Board and that in this particular case there was an association of individuals, a known Communist faction, a man who had been identified with certain Communist activities had written a decision which we felt was a serious prejudice to the case of our union.

Now, in response to the question as to whether or not any of our unions have been taken over, there were two unions which we felt—two of our own unions which we felt came into the Communist orbit by reason of their adherence to Communist Party programs and by reason of their expressed sympathy with the enemies of our organization in this particular controversy.

There was one, particularly, which was known as the Film Technicians, a very important group. In our judgment this union was captured in 1940. We watched their activities. They adhered to the Communist Party line and, as a matter of fact, they were one of the organizations that helped to found the Conference of Studio Unions.

At the time when the studio unions got ready, however, to engage in open combat with the IATSE this union withdrew from the Conference of Studio Unions and in this last strike at a very critical time in the activities of the strike, this union revolted and officially joined the strike with the Conference of Studio Unions.

As a result of that action, in accordance with the authority in our constitution, the international declared an emergency and took over the affairs of that local union.

The evidence which we have been able to get convinces us positively that union was in the hands of leaders who were adherents to the Communist Party program from 1940 on until their revolt in 1947.

There is one statement in the record which I made in the record this morning, and that was in respect to my testimony about a libel suit. I testified to that with respect to the documents which I presented. I wanted the committee to know that when the proof of this membership activity was established the libel suit has never been pressed. The libel suit was never brought to trial. I didn't want the record to stand without that in there.

Mr. McDOWELL. Is it still pending?

Mr. BREWER. It is still laying there as it was almost 3 years ago when it was filed.

Mr. McDOWELL. You called somebody a Communist and they sued for how much?

Mr. BREWER. \$150,000.

Mr. McDOWELL. You did better than I did, I got \$100,000.

Mr. BREWER. We are being sued for so many—

The CHAIRMAN. I don't think that is very pertinent.

Mr. GASTON. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Brewer. We will call on you, probably, later on so if you will just stand by so that you can complete your testimony at a later date, we will appreciate it. Mr. Stripling will advise you.⁶³


Mr. BREWER. Thank you very much.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. Adjourned until 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Thereupon, at 4 p. m., the committee adjourned until 10 a. m., the following day, Wednesday, October 29, 1947.)

⁶³ See appendix, pp. 541-545, for letter from Mr. Roy M. Brewer, as exhibit 76.



HEARINGS REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

The record will show that a subcommittee is sitting, with Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, and Mr. Thomas present.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Messrs. Louis J. Russell, H. A. Smith, Robert B. Gaston, investigators; and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

Now, the Chair at this point would like to make a brief recapitulation with reference to the committee's investigation of Communist influences in the motion-picture industry.

Responding to the demand of the people, the present Committee on Un-American Activities made a preliminary investigation which produced ample evidence that a full-scale investigation was in order of the extent of Communist infiltration in Hollywood.

This committee has utilized the services of trained investigators, all former FBI agents, to assemble this evidence in this manner.

The committee's authority to conduct such an investigation, under authority of Public Law 601, is crystal clear.

We have not violated and we are not violating the rights of any American citizen, not even the rights of the Communists whose first allegiance is to a foreign government.

The committee is well aware that powerful influences have sought in every manner to divert this committee from its main course of inquiry.

I am proud to say that this committee has not been swayed, intimidated, or influenced by either Hollywood glamor, pressure groups, threats, ridicule, or high-pressure tactics on the part of high-paid puppets and apologists for certain elements of the motion-picture industry.

The people are going to get the facts, just as I announced on the opening day.

This committee has now been sitting for 7 days. Last week we had before us 20 witnesses, all of whom had been subpoenaed, all of whom were tops in their profession, and all from Hollywood. They are among our most prominent producers, directors, writers, and actors. Their names stand high, not only in Hollywood, but throughout the world, as great entertainers and producers of entertainment. They

certainly had more at stake in Hollywood than some of the actors who have descended upon Washington, with stars and starlets to bowl over a committee of the Congress of the United States who dared to put the spotlight on the Communist foreign agents operating within their very industry.

These prominent Americans who appeared the first week, all from the industry, are the ones who leveled the charges; it wasn't the committee.

And now, in the second week, when those who have been accused publicly, openly, of being Communists and of attempting to utilize the motion picture for the furtherance of a ruthless dictatorship, have they come before this committee and answered these charges? No. They have come as Communists always do and scream, "Bill of Rights," "Constitution," and vilify those who would seek to expose them.

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind who has attended these meetings that Mr. Lawson, Mr. Trumbo, Mr. Bessie, and Mr. Maltz are Communists. They have been Communists for a long while and they will continue to be Communists, serving not the best interests of the United States, but the best interests of a foreign government.

Oh, yes, the paid apologists for these people have employed full-page ads in an effort to distort and to divert the beam of exposure which they saw was descending upon them from this committee. This is to state to the American people and to everyone concerned that this beam is not going to be turned off or shut off until all the Communists in Hollywood are exposed.

Mr. STRIPLING, call the next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Samuel Ornitz.

The CHAIRMAN. Who?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Samuel Ornitz.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ornitz.

Mr. Ornitz, raise your right hand, please.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. ORNITZ. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF SAMUEL ORNITZ

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Ornitz, will you please state your full name and present address?

Mr. ORNITZ. Samuel Ornitz, 1044 South Redondo Boulevard, Los Angeles.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Ornitz?

Mr. ORNITZ. New York City, November 15, 1890.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. ORNITZ. I am a writer.

I wish the opportunity to make a statement—

The CHAIRMAN. Now, just be identified, please.

Mr. ORNITZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is sufficient identification, Mr. Chairman.

At this point, if he has a statement—

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to see the statement.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have a copy?

Mr. CRUM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. We want to see the statement, to see if it is pertinent to the inquiry, and also whether it answers the charges that have been leveled against you.

(Statement handed to the chairman.)

Mr. McDOWELL. I wouldn't have any part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ornitz, this statement is clearly out of order. It is not at all pertinent. It is just another case of vilification, and the statement will not be read by you.

Mr. ORNITZ. I beg to differ with the chairman——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. ——

Mr. ORNITZ. This statement is particularly pertinent——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. ORNITZ. In that I am accused——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Just a minute——

Mr. ORNITZ. Here——

The CHAIRMAN. Ask another question——

Mr. ORNITZ. I beg your pardon——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Ask another question——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Ornitz——

Mr. ORNITZ. I accuse the members of this committee of being——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). You will not accuse anybody——

Mr. ORNITZ. I do accuse them——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Step aside from the witness stand——

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ornitz, you are here before this committee in response to a subpoena; are you not? ⁶⁴

Mr. ORNITZ. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. A subpoena which was served upon you on September 25; is that correct?

Mr. ORNITZ. Correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are also here in response to a telegram which was sent to you by the chairman on October 11: is that correct? ⁶⁵

Mr. ORNITZ. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were subpoenaed here for the purpose of submitting yourself to questioning by the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. ORNITZ. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. Certain questions will be directed to you. You are expected to answer those questions.

Mr. ORNITZ. I am prepared to answer them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. ORNITZ. I wish to reply to that question by saying that this involves a serious question of conscience for me.

The CHAIRMAN. Conscience?

Mr. ORNITZ. Conscience, sir, conscience.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. ORNITZ. I am replying to that question to the best of my ability and in spite of the interruptions.

⁶⁴ See appendix, p. 545, for exhibit 77.

⁶⁵ See appendix, p. 545, for exhibit 88.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, are you a member? That is the thing.

Mr. ORNITZ. If I may reply to it in less detail than our chairman did this morning, in practicing intimidation, as he has practiced it continually during this hearing——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, this has nothing to do with the question—the answer the witness has given.

Mr. ORNITZ. I have tried to answer this question several times now. I will make another attempt.

Mr. STRIPLING. It is a very simple question, Mr. Ornitz. Are you or are you not a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. ORNITZ. The question of conscience and constitutional rights are not simple matters to me.

Mr. STRIPLING. It has nothing to do with conscience or constitutional rights, Mr. Ornitz.

Mr. ORNITZ. If you will let me answer your question, I will establish that.

Kindly let me answer the question. I am asking this as a citizen and taxpayer of representatives of my Government, to let me answer the question conscientiously. I say you do raise a serious question of conscience for me when you ask me to act in concert with you to override the Constitution.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. ORNITZ. Wait a minute. Let me answer the question——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Ask the next question.

Mr. McDOWELL. Ask the next question.

Mr. ORNITZ. You are asking me to violate a constitutional guaranty.

Mr. STRIPLING. It does not involve a constitutional guaranty.

Mr. ORNITZ. It does.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel.) Mr. Stripling, ask the next question.

Mr. ORNITZ. I want to answer this question. It is against the Constitution——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Ask the next question.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have refused to answer the question.

Mr. ORNITZ. I have not refused. I have not been allowed to finish my answer. It is against the Constitution to ask me to reveal—not to reveal, but to state, to violate the sanctity of association.

Mr. McDOWELL. Ask the next question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Ornitz, you stated that you were a writer. The Screen Writers Guild is a recognized union or guild within the motion-picture industry. Certainly there could be nothing compromising by answering whether or not you are a member of that guild. You are not ashamed of being a member of the guild; are you?

Mr. ORNITZ. I have wanted to answer the question, in my way, and not your way.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. I am quite aware of that—that you don't want to answer it.

Now, Mr. Ornitz, I will ask you this question——

Mr. ORNITZ. I do want to answer——

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you now, or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party of the United States?

Mr. ORNITZ. I wish to state to you that my political affiliations, like my religious affiliation, is a matter fully guaranteed by the Constitution. I can belong to any party that I see fit to join, and you have no right to inquire into——

Mr. STRIPLING. Even though that party may be affiliated with a foreign government and directed by a foreign government?

Mr. ORNITZ. That is a loaded question, and I will not fall for it.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). All right; the witness——

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. ORNITZ. I have replied to that. You have no right to ask me that question.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). The witness is through.

Mr. ORNITZ. I wish——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Stand aside.

Mr. ORNITZ. I wish to repeat——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Stand away.

The next witness. Go ahead. All right; next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell, take the stand.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Russell has previously been sworn in this hearing. He has also been identified previously as an investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Russell was with the Federal Bureau of Investigation 10 years as an agent.

Mr. Russell, were you detailed to make an investigation to determine whether or not Samuel Ornitz was a member of the Communist Party at any time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give the committee the results of your investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. During the course of my investigation I obtained information regarding the Communist Party registration card which was made out in the name of Sam O. According to a code which I obtained in connection with this registration card, the name Sam O. is the Communist Party registration of Samuel Ornitz. This registration card, a photostatic copy of which I have before me, bears the number 47181. It contains a notation: "1944, Card No. 41826." The address of "Sam O." is given as 1044 South Redondo; city, Los Angeles; county, Los Angeles; State, California. This card contains a notation: "New card issued on December 2, 1944." The description of Sam Ornitz as given on this card is as follows: "Male. Occupation, writer. Industry, motion picture." The question is then asked: "Member of CIO, AFL, independent union, or no union." "Independent union" is checked. Another question is asked: "Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker?" "Yes" is checked.⁶⁶

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a memorandum prepared by the investigating and research staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities regarding the Communist association and affiliation of Samuel Ornitz. We have listed here 30 affiliations, contained on 7 pages.

⁶⁶ See appendix, p. 545, for exhibit 79.

Mr. Ornitz is the author of over 20 pictures made by various studios in Hollywood.

What is the pleasure of the committee regarding the reading of this information on Samuel Ornitz?

The CHAIRMAN. Start reading, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will ask Mr. Gaston to read this, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GASTON (reading):

According to the Motion Picture Almanac and other authoritative sources, Samuel Ornitz has been connected with the motion-picture industry since 1930, as a screen writer. Among the pictures he wrote are the following:

May we skip the list of pictures, sir?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

(The films referred to are as follows:)

The Richest Man in the World (M-G-M), 1930; Sins of the Children (M-G-M), 1930; Men of America (RKO), 1932; Secrets of the French Police (RKO), 1932; Hell's Highway (RKO), 1932; Imitation of Life (Universal), 1934; One Man's Journey (RKO), 1933; The Man Who Reclaimed His Head (Universal), 1934; One Exciting Adventure (Universal), 1934; Three Kids and a Queen (Universal), 1935; Mark of the Vampire (M-G-M), 1935; Follow Your Heart (Republic), 1936; Fatal Lady (Paramount), 1936; A Doctor's Diary (Paramount), 1937; Two Wise Maids (Republic), 1937; Portia on Trial (Republic), 1937; The Hit Parade (Republic), 1937; King of the Newsboys (Republic), 1938; Army Girl (Republic), 1938; Little Orphan Annie (Paramount), 1938.

Mr. GASTON (reading):

The files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the following information concerning the Communist-front affiliations of Samuel Ornitz:

1. There is no evidence of any open admission of Communist Party membership by Samuel Ornitz. However, Rena M. Vale, a former member of the Communist Party, has cited Samuel Ornitz as a fellow member in her affidavit dated November 23, 1942, according to the 1943 report of the California Joint Fact Finding Committee on Un-American Activities. Miss Vale said that in 1935 "Samuel Ornitz identified himself to me as a Communist Party member and discussed at considerable length the intentions of the Communist Party in Hollywood and especially in relation to the motion-picture industry" (p. 123).

Testimony of Ivan Francis Cox, former member of the Communist Party, before the California Superior Court on December 8, 1937, reflects also that Samuel Ornitz was a member of the Communist Party. The California Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities has listed Samuel Ornitz as a financial contributor to the Communist Party as of August 15 and September 11, 1940, according to testimony received in that committee. Testimony presented by George Oliver Bertholon, former members of the Communist Party and Young Communist League—

The CHAIRMAN. We will suspend there for just a second. Without objection, we will suspend with the further reading of the document. It will be placed in full in the record at this point as though read and will also be made public.

(The remainder of the document referred to is as follows:)

Testimony presented by George Oliver Bertholon, former member of the Communist Party and Young Communist League before an executive session of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (vol. 3, p. 1161, executive hearings) reflects that Mrs. Samuel (Sadie) Ornitz was a member of the Communist Party and that her son, Donald Raymond Ornitz, was a member of the Young Communist League.

According to Communist standards, party members are not supposed to have even personal relations with those who are hostile to the party.

The Daily Worker of September 14, 1932, page 1, listed Samuel Ornitz as a signer of A Call for Support of the Communist Party Candidates for President and Vice President, William Z. Foster and James W. Ford.

In a pamphlet entitled "Culture and the Crisis," on page 32, Samuel Ornitz is again listed as a member of the League of Professional Groups for Foster and Ford. In the Presidential campaign of 1936, an official letterhead of the Committee of Professional Groups for Browder and Ford, dated September 24, 1936, carries the name of Samuel Ornitz as a member. Earl Browder was at that time Communist candidate for President and James Ford was the Communist candidate for Vice President. The Daily Worker on March 5, 1941, page 2, carried a statement directed to President Roosevelt in defense of the Communist Party. Samuel Ornitz is shown as a signer of this statement.

2. Leo Gallagher has been a candidate for Secretary of State and other offices on the Communist Party ticket in California. Samuel Ornitz is shown as an active participant in a dinner in behalf of Leo Gallagher, according to the People's World of June 4, 1941. This was during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact.

3. The Daily Worker of June 25, 1936, page 2, lists Tom Mooney as a member of the honorary presidium of the Communist Party. His case was the center of world-wide Communist agitation. The Daily Worker of March 23, 1933, lists Samuel Ornitz as a speaker at a meeting in behalf of Tom Mooney held in San Francisco. The testimony presented in a California court on October 3, 1940, reflects that Mr. Ornitz wrote the dramatic skit for this case.

4. The People's World for April 3, 1945, contained an article headed "Memorial started for Eva Shafran—Education Foundation will serve Los Angeles labor, progressives." The article stated that "Plans for the organization of an Eva Shafran Educational Foundation as the best means of honoring Eva Shafran and carrying on the work of progressive education to which she devoted her life were made public here today. Samuel Ornitz, noted writer and lecturer, is chairman of the foundation. Eva Shafran was a well-known member of the Communist Party.

5. The People's Daily World is the official west-coast organ of the Communist Party. In its issue of July 9, 1943, Mr. Ornitz is listed as one who "enthusiastically sponsored and endorsed a call for a fund drive," in behalf of this paper. This Communist paper organized what was known as the Hollywood Forum, held at the Embassy Auditorium during the week of April 2, 1946, according to People's World, March 26, 1946, Ornitz was a speaker of this forum.

6. The Workers Bookshops are part of a chain of official Communist book shops scattered all over the country. According to the Daily Worker of August 28, 1934, Mr. Ornitz' works have been on sale at the Workers Bookshops in San Francisco. It should be noted, at this point, that Communist book shops do not promote hostile literature. At this time, Mr. Ornitz was a signer of a protest to the Governor of California and the mayor of San Francisco, in defense of the Workers Bookshops, according to the Daily Worker for August 28, 1934, page 5.

7. The American League for Peace and Democracy was formed by the Communist Party prior to the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact. According to former Attorney General Biddle, this organization was "established in the United States in an effort to create public sentiment in behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interest of the Soviet Union" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942). At that time this policy called for the support of the democracies against the Fascist aggressors in line with current Communist policies. This organization was also cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. A letterhead dated January 6-8, 1939, of the American Congress for Peace and Democracy organized by the American League for Peace and Democracy, shows Mr. Ornitz as an endorser.

Mr. Ornitz was also a speaker for the Los Angeles branch of this organization at a meeting held on September 28, 1938, at the Los Angeles Trinity Auditorium. According to the People's World of July 8, 1938, page 1, he was scheduled to speak at another Los Angeles meeting of this organization in behalf of Spanish refugees. The People's World of September 27, 1938, also lists him as a speaker for the American League for Peace and Democracy in Los Angeles.

8. The American League for Peace and Democracy was succeeded by the American Peace Mobilization, after the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact. According to former Attorney General Biddle, this organization was engaged in "picketing the White House, which began in April 1941, in protest against lend-lease and the entire national-defense program. This picket line was suddenly called off on the afternoon of June 21, 1941, when Hitler was opening his attack on the Soviet Union" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942).

This organization has also been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944. According to the Daily Worker of April 24, 1941, page 7, Mr. Ornitz was a leader of this organization. The American Peace Mobilization launched what it called the American Peace Crusade. According to the New Masses of August 6, 1940, page 23, Mr. Ornitz was the head of a Speakers' School of the Hollywood Peace Forum, in connection with this crusade. Again the People's World of April 19, 1940, lists Mr. Ornitz as a speaker at the Hollywood Peace Forum. This meeting was sponsored by the Hollywood League for Democratic Action, under the title "Can Our Ballots Stop Bullets?" He is also listed by the People's World of July 3, 1940, as a speaker at the Hollywood Peace Forum with Herbert Biberman at the Embassy Auditorium. Both Biberman and Ornitz were leading members of the American Peace Mobilization. On June 8, 1940, Mr. Ornitz was a speaker of a so-called peace assembly, held on the steps of the Los Angeles City Hall, under the auspices of the American Peace Mobilization and the American Peace Crusade. Mr. Ornitz also spoke at the Hollywood Peace Forum, held at the First Unitarian Church at Los Angeles on May 31, 1940.

He was also a speaker and a committee member of the American Peace Crusade meeting held at Los Angeles at the Embassy Auditorium, on June 21, 1940. He presented a radio address over station KFVD, on June 5, 1940, to supplement the campaign of the American Peace Mobilization. He spoke at the Hollywood Town Meeting under the auspices of the Hollywood Peace Forum on June 21, 1940. He also sent greetings to the meeting of the American Peace Mobilization held in Chicago, August 31, to September 2, 1940. Mr. Ornitz was a member of the resolutions committee at the Chicago meeting of the American Peace Mobilization.

The People's World of January 23, 1940, page 5, and February 8, 1940, page 5, lists him as the speaker at various so-called peace meetings held in Hollywood and Los Angeles.

Samuel Ornitz himself admitted he helped organize the American Peace Crusade, according to an article by Ornitz appearing in the New Masses for August 27, 1940, page 12.

The antiwar stand of the American Peace Mobilization was drastically altered when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941. The People's World dated July 7, 1941, page 3, quoted Tom Cullen, executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization as saying: "The invasion of the Soviet Union has altered the character of the present war * * *." The newspaper also stated that the American Peace Mobilization would hold a mass meeting on July 14, 1941, at the Philharmonic Auditorium at which the new policy of the APM and a program to aid the defeat of Hitlerism would be presented. That Samuel Ornitz went along with the American Peace Mobilization in its sudden twist is evidenced by the same newspaper article which stated that Ornitz would be one of the speakers at the aforementioned mass meeting.

9. The International Labor Defense, American section of the International Red Aid, with headquarters in Moscow, has been cited by former Attorney General Biddle as the "legal arm of the Communist Party" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942).

It has been cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front on June 25, 1942, March 29, 1944.

Its chief interest was the defense of Communist cases. According to a 1937 letterhead of the International Labor Defense, Mr. Ornitz was a member of its Advisory Board. He was also a member of its national committee. Equal Justice, official organ of the International Labor Defense, for May 1940, page 7, carries the greetings of Samuel Ornitz. Closely associated with the International Labor Defense, and similarly Ornitz.

Closely associated with the International Labor Defense, and similarly in its purposes, was the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners. This organization has been cited by Attorney General Biddle as "substantially equivalent to International Labor Defense, the legal arm of the Communist Party."

It has defended such prominent Communists as Angelo Herndon, William Schneiderman, and Earl Browder (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942). It has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Mr. Ornitz is listed as a member of this Committee on its letterhead dated October 31, 1935.

10. The National Committee for People's Rights was a successor organization to the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners. According

to Attorney General Biddle, "In January 1938 the name was changed to the National Committee for People's Rights" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942). This committee has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, and June 25, 1942. According to the official organ of the National Committee for People's Rights, entitled "News You Don't Get," for November 15, 1938, Mr. Ornitz is listed as a member.

11. The criminal syndicalism laws of the various States have been bitterly fought by the Communist Party because they are directed chiefly against their machinations. According to the New Masses, of December 1931, page 30, Mr. Ornitz is listed as a speaker at a meeting held at the Star Casino in New York, on December 6, 1931, to fight the "vicious criminal-syndicalism law of Kentucky."

12. The campaign in behalf of the Scottsboro boys was conducted chiefly by the International Labor Defense, described above. According to the Western Worker, official Communist organ of July 13, 1936, Mr. Ornitz was a participant at a benefit in behalf of the campaign for the Scottsboro boys, who had previously been convicted. This benefit affair was held at Club Alabama in Los Angeles.

13. World-wide condemnation accompanied the so-called Moscow trials, which were used by the Soviet Regime to eliminate all its critics. These trials were universally held to be a travesty of justice. According to Soviet Russia Today, of March, 1937, pages 14 and 15, Mr. Ornitz was a signer of an open letter to American liberals, defending these trials. A similar statement appeared in the Daily Worker of April 28, 1938, page 4, as a Statement of American Progressive on the Moscow Trials.

Mr. Ornitz again was listed as a signer.

Leon Trotsky was a Soviet official who broke with Stalin and sought asylum in Mexico. According to the Western Worker, a west-coast edition of the Daily Worker, dated March 1, 1937, Samuel Ornitz was one of the 51 persons who signed an open letter criticizing the American Committee for the Defense of Trotsky. The open letter also denounced demands for investigation of the Russian "purge" trial as political interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union with hostile intent.

International Literature is the official organ of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, which had its headquarters in Moscow. International Literature, No. 7, dated July 1938, page 105, listed a group of individuals who were signers to a "Statement of American Intellectuals."

The statement voiced approval of the attempt of the Soviet Union to preserve and extend its gains and strength by the then recent Moscow trials, and it supported efforts of the Soviet Union to "free itself from insidious internal dangers." Samuel Ornitz was listed as one of the signers of this statement.

14. In August 1943 a committee was organized for a reception for Prof. S. Michael's and Col. I. Feffer, members of the first official Soviet Jewish delegation to the United States. According to the Peoples World of August 9, 1943, page 3, Samuel Ornitz was a member of the national reception committee for these men.

15. New Masses is an official Communist weekly which has been cited as a Communist periodical by former Attorney General Francis Biddle (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942). It was also cited as a Communist magazine by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 24, 1942, and March 29, 1944. Samuel Ornitz has contributed to New Masses, as evidenced by the issues of the publication dated December 1931, page 4; October 1931, page 3; August 27, 1940, page 12; and August 12, 1941, page 19. It is an accepted Communist practice to limit the use of the columns of its publications to persons who toe the party line.

16. The Zukas-SCMWA Committee was organized in defense of B. Joseph Zukas, who was a Communist leader of the State, County, and Municipal Workers in the California Relief Administration, whose activities were under investigation by a California State Assembly committee in 1940. According to the letterhead of this committee, dated July 15, 1940, Mr. Ornitz was a sponsor.

17. The Morning Freiheit is the official Communist organ in the Jewish language. The Peoples World of October 18, 1943, page 3, lists Mr. Ornitz as vice chairman of the Los Angeles Chapter of the Morning Freiheit Association.

The Peoples World for April 16, 1947, reported that Paul Novick, editor in chief of the Morning Freiheit, New York City, would speak on April 19, 1947, at the Embassy Auditorium, Ninth and Grand Streets, in celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Freiheit. The article further stated that Samuel Ornitz, "president of the Freiheit Association, Los Angeles," and Harry Daniels, legislative director of the Communist Party, would also speak at the celebration.

18. Acting in accordance with the instructions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International issued in the summer of 1935, the Communist Party conducted an active campaign in behalf of the Spanish Communists during the Spanish Civil War. At a meeting held at the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles on February 24, 1937, Mr. Ornitz contributed toward a fund in support of these efforts.

19. The Abraham Lincoln Battalion (Brigade) was a military organization recruited by the Communist Party for the purpose of giving military aid to the Spanish Communists.

Earl Browder, former executive secretary of the Communist Party has admitted that 60 percent of its corps were members of the Communist Party. Mr. Ornitz is listed by the Peoples World of July 19, 1938, as a speaker for an organization known as the Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade.

The Peoples World of July 30, 1938, page 3, lists him as a speaker in honor of Harry Hynes and Virgil Rhetta, who were both members of the Communist Party, killed in action under the Abraham Lincoln Battalion. The Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade is cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on March 29, 1944, as is also the Abraham Lincoln Brigade or Battalion.

20. The League of American Writers was the American affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow. It has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

It has also been cited as under Communist auspices by Attorney General Biddle in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942. The organization has been pledged to the defense of the Soviet Union and "use of art as an instrument of the class struggle." Mr. Ornitz is listed by the Daily Worker of January 18, 1935, page 5, as a signer of the call for the Congress of American Revolutionary Writers, which founded the League of American Writers.

The Daily Worker of September 14, 1942, page 7, lists Mr. Ornitz as a signer of a statement issued by the League of American Writers demanding the opening of a second front. This statement was issued after Hitler's attack on Stalin and the change of the Communist Party line from antiwar to prowar.

Samuel Ornitz also was one of the signers of the call to the fourth congress, held by the League of American Writers in New York City, June 6-8, 1941.

21. The Writers Congress held October 1, 2, 3, 1943, was organized by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, as successor to the Hollywood Chapter of the League of American Writers. On the official program of the Writers Congress, Mr. Ornitz is listed as a member of the panel of minority groups.

22. The Progressive Citizens of America was founded as a frankly pro-communist group as a result of a split in the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, after Harold L. Ickes and other liberals had condemned the Independent Citizens Committee as Communist dominated. Mr. Ornitz is listed by the Daily Worker of July 5, 1947, page 11, as a participant in the conference of the Hollywood arts, sciences, and professions council of the Progressive Citizens of America. The Progressive Citizens of America has been cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist front in its report on June 12, 1947.

23. The Hollywood Anti-Nazi League was founded by Isaac Romaine, alias V. J. Jerome, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. It was dissolved upon the signing of the Stalin-Hitler Pact. According to the Hollywood Now of June 16, 1939, official organ of the League, Mr. Ornitz is listed as a member who was active since the organization was founded. According to the People's World of August 11, 1938, page 1, he was a speaker at a meeting which founded the organization. Hollywood Now of September 28, 1938, again lists him as a speaker.

24. The International Workers Order was cited by Attorney General Biddle as "one of the strongest Communist organizations" (Congressional Record September 24, 1942). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities has cited this organization as a Communist front on January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942. The organization has actively supported Communist campaigns, candidates, and the Communist Party press.

On February 4, 1940, Mr. Ornitz was the principal speaker at a meeting of the International Workers Order, held at 972 North Hobart Boulevard, Los Angeles.

Again, the People's World of June 4, 1943, page 2, lists him as a speaker under the auspices of the Fraz Boas Lodge of the International Workers Order in Los

Angeles. The Peoples World of November 16, 1943, page 2, mentions Mr. Ornitz as a speaker at a meeting held on November 22, 1943, at Carpenters Hall, 5164 Santa Monica Boulevard, Los Angeles.

25. The Hollywood League for Democratic Action cooperated with the Hollywood Peace Forum at a meeting held at the Wilshire-Ebell Auditorium on May 3, 1940. Mr. Ornitz was a speaker. The Hollywood League for Democratic Action was the predecessor of the Hollywood branch of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which is mentioned above.

26. The American Student Union has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. The Rapp-Conder committee investigating Communist activities in the New York public schools has cited this as an organization "for transmitting the aims and programs of which the Young Communist League is the initiating and projecting element."

Mr. Ornitz was one of the principal instructors of the American Student Union camp held in the San Bernardino Mountains from August 18 to 25, 1940.

27. The Workers International Relief was an international organization, with headquarters in Moscow, which raised funds for Communist-led strikes and campaigns throughout the world. It was closely associated with the International Labor Defense. According to the Daily Worker of May 8, 1934, Mr. Ornitz was the chairman of an open-forum meeting, held in Los Angeles on April 15, 1934, in behalf of the Workers International Relief.

28. According to Peoples World of January 21, 1940, Mr. Ornitz was a sponsor for the Conference for Democratic Action held at Fresno, Calif. This organization has been cited as a Communist front by the California Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report for 1943, page 91. It is closely linked to the Hollywood League for Democratic Action cited above.

29. Actors Laboratory was a training school for actors in Hollywood whose officers have lengthy records of Communist-front activity as evidenced in attached reports; such officers include Roman Bohnen, chairman, Larry Parks, treasurer; Morris Carnovsky, Jules Dassin, Edward Dmytryk, members of the executive board.

The organization cooperated with the Hollywood Writers Mobilization which has been described above. An undated leaflet of the Actors Laboratory Theatre, entitled "An Evening for the Lab" lists Samuel Ornitz and his wife as "audience sponsors."

30. The Motion Picture Artists Committee was an affiliate of the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, which was also part of the campaign to aid Spanish Communists. The North American Committee was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944, and by Prof. John Dewey's Committee for Cultural Freedom in April 1940. The Motion Picture Artists Committee was led by William Gropper, well-known cartoonist for the Communist press, and Kyle Christon, alias Robert Forsythe, a frequent contributor to New Masses. Samuel Ornitz was a member of the Motion Picture Artists Committee, according to Who's Who in America, volume 20 (1938-39), page 1904.

The CHAIRMAN. Next witness, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Ring Lardner, Jr.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lardner. Ring Lardner, Jr., is the next witness.

Mr. KENNY. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Stripling, Mr. Lardner was notified to hold himself in readiness, if you recall. He was subpoenaed. He is not in attendance today. However, if you indicate when you wish him here, I will see that he is available.

Mr. STRIPLING. He has been here almost every day, has he not?

Mr. KENNY. Well, the last week nearly every day. And I think we can get Mr. Lardner—

The CHAIRMAN. Is he in the city now, do you know?

Mr. KENNY. I don't know. I think—well, I have 19 clients and I haven't kept track of them. I think I can locate him for you.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, you locate him as quickly as possible and tell him we want him here today.

Mr. KENNY. I will. Because he has not been given a definite time to appear. I have not had an opportunity to talk with him on his constitutional rights, as the other witnesses, so I would like some time in order to discuss matters with him.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is true, but Mr. Lardner has been here almost every day.

Mr. KENNY. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. He knows just what has been going. He knows just what the other witnesses have been doing. They have all acted under your instruction.

Mr. KENNY. No; they haven't.

The CHAIRMAN. As his attorney, we want you to get Mr. Lardner as soon as possible.

Next witness——

Mr. KENNY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I will get him as soon as possible, but "possible" does include, I am sure, a reasonable opportunity to consult with counsel on his constitutional rights, does it not?

The CHAIRMAN. You have already had that opportunity.

Mr. KENNY. Not with Mr. Lardner.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, not with Mr. Lardner?

Mr. KENNY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Kenny, is Mr. Biberman here?

Mr. KENNY. Yes; Mr. Biberman is here. You subpoenaed him.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Biberman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Herbert Biberman.

(Mr. Herbert Biberman, accompanied by Robert W. Kenny, counsel, takes place at witness table.)

The CHAIRMAN. Will you raise your right hand, please?

Mr. Biberman, do you solemnly swear that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BIBERMAN. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

Mr. BIBERMAN. Mr. Chairman——

TESTIMONY OF HERBERT BIBERMAN

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Biberman, will you state your full name and present address, please?

Mr. BIBERMAN. Herbert Joseph Biberman, 3259 Deronda Drive, Hollywood, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Biberman?

Mr. BIBERMAN. I was born within a stone's throw of Independence Hall in Philadelphia, on the day when Mr. McKinley was inaugurated as President of the United States, March 4, 1900, on the second floor of a building at Sixth and South, over a grocery store.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Biberman, would you assure the committee that you will be as detailed and specific in all your answers?

Mr. BIBERMAN. I assure you I will be as detailed and specific in answers to any questions you direct at me.

Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here which I feel has the greatest relevance to the subject of this inquiry and to the chairman's remark of this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you fully identified this witness?

Mr. BIBERMAN. I would——

The CHAIRMAN (sounding gavel). Just a minute. Have you fully identified this witness?

Mr. STRIPLING. No, sir; I haven't.

The CHAIRMAN. Then continue to identify him.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. BIBERMAN. I am a director, a producer, and a writer—in the theater in the past and in motion pictures at present.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. BIBERMAN. Since 1935, January 2.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have been a writer?

Mr. BIBERMAN. I have been a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you been a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BIBERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here I ask you to look at. Would you kindly do that now?

(Statement handed to the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Biberman, this statement is clearly not pertinent. If another case——

Mr. BIBERMAN. You mean because it is directly on the subject, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. It is another case of vilification, and therefore will not be read.

Mr. BIBERMAN. There is no vilification in this statement. I feel your refusal to allow me to read it is a shameful and cowardly act.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Next question, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Biberman, are you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild or have you ever been a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. BIBERMAN. Mr. Stripling, I would like to reply to this very quietly—Mr. Chairman, also. If I will not be interrupted, I will attempt to give you a full answer to this question.

It has become very clear to me that the real purpose of this investigation——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). That is not an answer to the question——

Mr. BIBERMAN. Is to drive a wedge——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). That is not the question. (Pounding gavel.)

Mr. BIBERMAN. Into the component parts——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Not the question——

Mr. BIBERMAN. Of the motion-picture industry.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Ask him the next question.

Mr. BIBERMAN. And by defending my constitutional rights here I am defending——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Go ahead and ask him the next question.

Mr. BIBERMAN. The right not only of ourselves——

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member——

Mr. BIBERMAN. But of the producers and of the American people.

Mr. STRIPLING. Of the Communist Party?

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member of the Communist Party or have you ever been?

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member——

Mr. BIBERMAN. What is the question now?

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BIBERMAN. It is perfectly clear, gentlemen, that if you continue in this particular fashion——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, will you direct the witness——

Mr. BIBERMAN. You have only one idea——

Mr. STRIPLING. To answer the question?

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question.

Mr. BIBERMAN. And that is to cause strife in the industry——

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). You are excused——

Mr. BIBERMAN. Chaos in the industry, and this I will not permit.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you direct the witness to answer that question before he leaves the stand?

Mr. BIBERMAN. I have not refused to answer the question. I told you before I will answer this question fully.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Biberman——

Mr. BIBERMAN. Your purpose is to use this to disrupt the motion-picture industry——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. BIBERMAN. To invade the right not only of me——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. BIBERMAN. But of the producers——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. BIBERMAN. To their thoughts and to their opinions——

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. BIBERMAN. And this I will not permit.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you refuse to answer whether or not you are now or have ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BIBERMAN. Mr. Stripling, I apologize for one thing and that is raising my voice. I had no intention of doing so. [Laughter.]

I told you many times, if you will not interrupt me, I will answer this question at great length. Shall I proceed with answering this question?

The CHAIRMAN. No. You can answer the question "Yes" or "No." That is a very simple question.

Mr. BIBERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would be very suspicious of any answer that came out of my mouth that pleased this committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would, too.

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). All right, you are excused. Take him away.

Next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. I want the record to show that Mr. Biberman was before the committee in response to a subpoena served upon him on September 22, and also in response to a wire sent to him on October 11. I will now ask that Mr. Russell take the stand.⁶⁷

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell.

⁶⁷ See appendix, p. 546, for exhibits 80 and 81.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, you have made and were instructed to make an investigation to determine whether or not Herbert Biberman, a writer-director from Hollywood, is now or was in the past a member of the Communist Party of the United States?

MR. RUSSELL. I was.

MR. STRIPLING. Give the committee the results of your investigation.

MR. RUSSELL. During the course of my investigation I obtained information regarding Communist Party registration card of Herbert Biberman for the year 1944. This card bears the number 47267. It is made out in the name "Herbert Biberman." The address is given as 3259 Deronda Drive, city, Los Angeles, county, Los Angeles, State, California. This card contains a statement "New card issued on December 10, 1944." It contains another notation: "1944 card No. 46844."⁶⁸

The description of Herbert Biberman is given as follows: Male. Occupation, director. Industry, motion pictures. Color, white. The question is asked: Member of CIO, A. F. of L. independent union or no union. Independent union is checked. Another question contained on the card, a photostatic copy of which I have before me is member club subscriber for Daily Worker? Above that is a notation in ink "PW"—meaning People's World. The answer "Yes" is checked.

MR. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

MR. CHAIRMAN, our investigation shows without any doubt that Mr. Biberman is a member of the Communist Party. I don't think anything could better characterize his affiliation, however, than to point out that during the period of the Soviet-Nazi pact Mr. Biberman was a member of the National Council of the American Peace Mobilization. In fact, his name appears as one of the signers of the call. He was the honorary chairman of the Los Angeles Branch of the organization. Everyone remembers the treasonable activities of the American Peace Mobilization.

Now, we have a memorandum here on Mr. Biberman prepared by the committee's staff, in which 19 separate affiliations are listed.

What is the desire of the committee, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN. All right, start reading.

MR. STRIPLING. Is it all right if Mr. Gaston reads, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN. Yes.

MR. GASTON (reading):

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES—
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OF HERBERT BIBERMAN

Herbert Biberman, according to the International Motion Picture Almanac has written the following films: King of Chinatown, Road to Yesterday, and The Master Race. He has also directed One Way Ticket and Meet Nero Wolfe.

The files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities, contain the following information concerning the Communist and Communist-front affiliation of Mr. Biberman:

1. The People's Educational Center was founded and is conducted by leading members of the Communist Party in Los Angeles and Hollywood. It is the successor to the Communist Los Angeles Workers School, which participated in the founding and development of the People's Educational Center.

⁶⁸ See appendix, p. 546, for exhibit 82.

The People's World of January 13, 1944, page 4, states that Herbert Biberman was on the staff of the People's Educational Center during that year, and according to the summer 1945 catalog of that school, he was listed as a lecturer. His biography included therein states that he spent "6 months in the U. S. S. R. studying the Soviet theater." The People's World is the official west coast organ of the Communist Party. Herbert Biberman's affiliation with the People's Educational Center during the year 1947 is shown in Variety, June 30, 1947, page 10.

2. In an exhibit presented before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities during the public hearings (vol. 14, p. 8585), Herbert Biberman's name appears as a sponsor of a testimonial dinner to Leo Gallagher. In 1938 Leo Gallagher was the Communist Party candidate for the office of secretary of state in California. The dinner was held on June 2, 1941, in Los Angeles.

3. Mr. Biberman has written for the New Masses, the official weekly magazine of the Communist Party which was described as a "Communist periodical" by Attorney General Francis Biddle in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, page 7688. His contributions appear in the issues of August 20, 1940, page 8; June 17, 1941, page 17; July 8, 1941, page 26; and July 29, 1941, page 16.

4. The Daily Worker of September 3, 1940, page 4, which is the official organ of the Communist Party of the United States, named Herbert Biberman as a member of the National Council of the American Peace Mobilization, and his name appears as one of the signers of the Call to the American People's Meeting which was held in New York City, April 5-6, 1941.

The proceedings of the first convention, November 30-December 1, 1940, page 4, also lists his name as the honorary chairman of the Los Angeles Branch of the organization. The American Peace Mobilization will be remembered as the organization which picketed the White House during the time of the Stalin-Hitler pact. On the day that Hitler attacked Russia, the pickets were withdrawn from the White House. According to New Masses of August 6, 1940, page 22, Herbert Biberman was the temporary chairman and speaker at an April 6, 1940, mass meeting of the American Peace Crusade, which was the forerunner of the American Peace Mobilization in California.

He was also listed as an officer of the American Peace Crusade in the leaflet, We, the People of the United States Will Keep Out of War, published by that organization. According to the Daily Worker of April 21, 1941, page 7, Herbert Biberman was a leader of the American Peace Crusade which aided in the formation of the American Peace Mobilization. The Emergency Peace Mobilization was held on August 31 to September 2, 1940, in Chicago, for the purpose of organizing the American Peace Mobilization.

5. Mr. Biberman is listed on a program leaflet of June 7, 1940, page 4, and a letterhead of June 3, 1940, as a member of the provisional committee of the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944.

The Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America was the predecessor to the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, an organization noted for its defense of Communists. A letterhead of the latter organization lists Mr. Biberman as a sponsor.

In addition to being cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, and by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of June 12, 1947, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties was cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle in these words: "The defenses of Communist leaders such as Sam Darcy and Robert Wood, party secretaries for Pennsylvania and Oklahoma, have been major efforts of the federation" (Congressional Record, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687).

6. The American Committee to Save Refugees was a part of the Communist campaign for Loyalist Spain, and it provided transportation and support for international Communist agents such as Gerhart Eisler. An undated folder, "For the Rescue of Refugees," lists the name of Herbert Biberman as a signer of a pro-Soviet statement of this organization. The American Committee to Save Refugees was also cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311, March 29, 1944.

7. The Communist International at its seventh congress—

The CHAIRMAN. Suspend the reading, please. Without objection, further reading will be dispensed with. It will all be placed in the record at this point.

(Balance of the statement referred to above is as follows:)

The Communist International at its Seventh congress which was held in Moscow in 1935, instructed the various Communist Parties to assist in the Spanish Communist cause. The Communist Party of the United States, in response to these orders, set up a Spanish-aid campaign and formed organizations to accomplish this task.

One of these was the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in reports of January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944, as well as by the Committee for Cultural Freedom, Professor Dewey, chairman, April 1940. Herbert Biberman was listed as a member of the local sponsoring committee for the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy in a letterhead of that committee.

8. The Daily Worker of August 17, 1937, page 3, reveals that Herbert Biberman was a sponsor of a benefit for Spanish Loyalist children, and another Daily Worker, that of September 17, 1937, page 9, shows that he was a contributor to an ambulance for Loyalist Spain. Both of these projects were a part of a campaign in behalf of the Spanish Communist cause organized by the Communist Party in accordance with the orders of the Communist International.

9. The first congress of Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples, which was supported by Latin-American Communist Parties was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944, and by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of September 2, 1947. A mimeographed release, dated March 24-26, 1939, lists Mr. Biberman as a signer of the call to the congress.

10. The Hollywood Democratic Committee, which succeeded the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League, organized by Isaac Romaine, also known as V. J. Jerome, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party. Mr. Biberman's connection with this organization is shown by an official ballot, dated July 26, 1944, on which his name appeared as a candidate for office in that organization.

11. The Communist press has given its support to a petition for the pardon of Festus Coleman, of which Mr. Biberman was a signer, according to the People's World, October 16, 1942, page 2.

12. According to the Daily Worker, September 14, 1942, page 7, and People's World, September 23, 1942, page 5, Herbert Biberman was a signer of a statement of the League of American Writers in behalf of a second front. The League of American Writers has been pledged to defend the Soviet Union and "use of art as an instrument of the class struggle." The Clipper, a publication of the league, lists Herbert Biberman as a contributor in its August 1941 copy, page 31. It was affiliated with the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow and has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on three occasions. (See committee reports, January 3, 1940, June 15, 1942, and March 29, 1944.) Also, Attorney General Francis Biddle has said that "the overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686).

13. The New Theatre of July 1936, page 14, contains an article by Mr. Biberman. New Theatre was the official organ of the League of Workers Theatres, an affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Theatres, with headquarters in Moscow, and was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in report 1311, March 29, 1944.

14. The Associated Film Audiences, which merged with Films for Democracy to form Film Audiences for Democracy, was organized for the purpose of gaining the support of audiences for pro-Communist films. During the time of the Stalin-Hitler pact it was antiwar in conformance with the Communist Party line. Mr. Biberman was a member of the executive board of Associated Film Audiences, according to Film Survey, May 1939, page 4.

15. A letterhead, dated February 2, 1944, lists Herbert Biberman as a national board member of the Jewish People's Committee, which was headed by William Weiner, Reuben Saltzman, Joseph R. Brodsky, and other leading Communists. In the report of March 29, 1944, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Jewish People's Committee as a Communist front.

16. Mr. Biberman's affiliation with the Consumers Union is shown by the Consumers Union Reports, December 1938, page 15, to which he was a contributor. The Consumers Union was led by Arthur Kallet, alias Edward Adams, a staff writer for the Daily Worker. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as a Communist front in the report of March 29, 1944.

17. Herbert Biberman's name appears on a letterhead of February 24, 1940, as a sponsor of the Hollywood League for Democratic Action, the predecessor of the Hollywood branch of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions. The issue of communism within the Independent Citizens Committee resulted in the dissolution of the organization and the resignation of Harold L. Ickes and other liberals. The Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Hollywood League for Democratic Action as a front organization defending Communists in the report of June 12, 1947. It was also cited by the Committee for Cultural Freedom, Prof. John Dewey, chairman, April 1940.

18. According to evidence submitted to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities during the public hearings (vol. 1, p. 569), Herbert Biberman was a member of the executive board of the Motion Picture Artists Committee, affiliated with the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

The Motion Picture Artists Committee was headed by William Gropper, Kyle Crichton, also known as Robert Forsythe, and other writers for the Communist press. The North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the reports of January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944, and by the Committee for Cultural Freedom, Prof. John Dewey, chairman, April 1940.

19. The Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions split after Harold Ickes and other liberals condemned the organization as Communist dominated. The pro-Communist section, after the split, formed the Progressive Citizens of America. The Progressive Citizens of America was cited as a Communist front by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in a report of June 12, 1947. The official ballot of the Progressive Citizens of America, dated September 17, 1947, lists Herbert Biberman as candidate for the executive board.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Vail makes his remark, I wonder if you would ask Mr. Kenny and Mr. Crum which one of their clients are present for examination at this time?

THE CHAIRMAN. Either Mr. Kenny or Mr. Crum, could you tell us the names of your clients who are present now?

MR. KENNY. Mr. Dmytryk is.

MR. CRUM. And we are advised, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Lardner will be detained but will be here this afternoon.

THE CHAIRMAN. Good. What other clients are here now?

MR. CRUM. We advised Mr. Stripling this morning that Mr. Adrian Scott has laryngitis, but he will be here at your pleasure. It was thought advisable until the committee wanted to hear him for him not to be here. We can have them here.

THE CHAIRMAN. How about Mr. Lavery.

MR. STRIPLING. You don't represent Mr. Lavery?

MR. CRUM. No; we do not.

THE CHAIRMAN. Is Mr. Lavery in the room?

MR. LAVERY. Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

MR. VAIL.

MR. VAIL. Mr. Chairman, I have before me a manual issued by the International Labor Defense, which is the legal arm of the Communist Party, containing instructions to members of the party who are apprehended by the law.

These instructions are as follows:

It is absolutely essential to remember that the policeman arresting you is a servant of the boss class. Otherwise why should he be arresting you for working-class activities. He is your enemy. Give him no information of any kind whatsoever, either about yourself or your fellow workers or any organization which you belong to or in which you are interested. No matter how innocently he may seek to get this information, no matter whether he tells you that this information is for the purpose of helping you, do not give it to him. Give no information in

the police station where you are brought by the arresting officer and booked. Booking means simply that the record of the arrest is made in a book. Give no information to any assistant district attorney who may come to you smilingly and in a kindly manner try to get information from you, stating that he is interested only in the truth and wants to help you. If, on the contrary, he comes to you in a threatening, bulldozing manner, trying to force information out of you, do not yield, and when we say no information we mean, above all, that you shall not give the names of your fellow workers, the names of organizations that you belong to, details about your union, or any other information, regardless of how innocent it may appear to you.

I believe that these members of the party have followed those instructions to the letter, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to announce that by unanimous vote of the subcommittee, the subcommittee recommends to the full committee that Samuel Ornitz and Herbert Biberman be cited for contempt and appropriate action be taken immediately.

The next witness, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Emmet Lavery.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lavery, will you raise your right hand, please?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LAVERY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Chairman, after being identified by Mr. Stripling, I have several very brief motions for the record which I would like to make.

I hasten to add that they are for the purpose of clarifying the discussion, not for obstructing the work of the committee.

I hope to be a reasonably responsive, and I hope eloquent, witness.

TESTIMONY OF EMMET G. LAVERY

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, will you state your full name and present address?

Mr. LAVERY. My name is Emmet G. Lavery. I live at 1075 Casiano Road, Los Angeles 24.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. LAVERY. I was born at Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Dutchess County, November 8, 1902.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. LAVERY. I am a playwright, screen writer, and member of the Bar of the State of New York.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a writer?

Mr. LAVERY. I have written, alternately, for the stage and screen, since the year 1934. At the present time I am rehearsing, or about to rehearse, in New York a play which has been variously described and was described before this committee.

In Hollywood, I am currently preparing for an independent film production, an adaptation of a play about the Jesuits, for The First Legion.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you give us the names of some of your plays, Mr. Lavery?

Mr. LAVERY. Gladly. I think the play—and I would be glad to offer a copy of it in evidence, by way of identification—with which the committee is probably most familiar is *The Magnificent Yankee*, a dramatization of the life of Mr. Justice Holmes from the biography by Francis Biddle, former Attorney General of the United States.

My screen plays best known are two that dealt with war topics: *Hitler's Children*, an adaptation from *Education for Death*, by Gregor Ziemer, and *Behind the Rising Sun*—both produced by R-K-O.

My writings for the theater have included *The First Legion*, which has been produced in 12 languages since it was first done in the United States in 1934; *Monsignor's Hour*; *Second Spring*, a play about Cardinal Newman and Cardinal Manning; *Brother Petroc's Return*, an adaptation of the English novel by an English nun; *Brief Music*; *Kamiano*, a play about Damien; *Murder in a Nunnery*, an adaptation of the English novel by Eric Shepherd.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, how long have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. LAVERY. I first went to Hollywood in 1934. I remained there until approximately 1937. I was in the East from 1937 to 1941. I returned to Hollywood in 1941. I remained in 1942. I came back East. I returned in 1943. And I have been there since.

And let me volunteer, if permitted, that I am now serving my third term—

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Lavery.

Mr. LAVERY. All right, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you answer this question—

Mr. LAVERY. Surely.

Mr. STRIPLING. Without an outburst: Are you a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, I wanted to volunteer the information that I am both a member and serving my third term as president.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you see anything incriminating in any way to a person answering whether or not he is a member of the Screen Writers' Guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, Mr. Stripling, as one lawyer to another, you know that is something for each individual to decide for himself. I can only answer for myself. For myself, I am delighted and proud to answer that I am president of the guild, to which I have been greatly devoted.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, isn't it true that the Screen Writers' Guild is the one big writers' organization or union within the motion-picture industry?

Mr. LAVERY. We are the only one. We are the recognized bargaining agency for screen writers in Hollywood, and our position there corresponds, roughly, to that of the Dramatists' Guild in New York or the Radio Writers' Guild or the Authors' League. As a matter of fact, we are affiliated with the Authors' League of America.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you explain to the committee why there is so much reluctance on the part of the previous witnesses to answer the simple question as to whether or not they belong to a recognized guild in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, I can't go into their minds. I don't know. But I would like to remind the Chair at this time that, in order to expedite the discussion, I would appreciate the opportunity to make several very brief motions—

Mr. STRIPLING. This is not a discussion, Mr. Lavery. It is for the purpose of obtaining facts.

Mr. LAVERY. Well, I stand corrected.

If I might make several brief motions, I assure you, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to argue them. I mean it is merely to have a notation for the record, with or without your permission—I mean, if you rule “no” on them it is perfectly all right with me.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask if these are motions to be made by you as a witness or motions to be made by you as an attorney, or motions made by your organization?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, I guess it is all three, Mr. Chairman. I am here today in about three capacities. I am here as myself, as counsel for myself, and as the only authorized spokesman for the Screen Writers' Guild of Hollywood, which has been mentioned considerably by witnesses before this committee.

So, on my own behalf, in various capacities, I simply wanted to make one or two requests of the Chair, to straighten out the record. If the rule is “no,” why we can simply go on with the examination.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I should like to state Mr. Lavery is here in response to a subpoena—

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment—calling for his appearance, rather.⁶⁹

Mr. LAVERY. I do want to say that I would be here, whether you gave me a subpoena or not.

The CHAIRMAN. I just want to find out whether these motions are pertinent to the inquiry of alleged communism in Hollywood.

Mr. LAVERY. I think so, Mr. Chairman. I wouldn't offer them if they weren't. I mean, they are right specifically on the nose.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have them in writing?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, the motions are oral, but a statement that I would like to offer I have here in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. Which do you want to offer first—the motion or the statement?

Mr. LAVERY. I would like to offer the motions first, if I might.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My first request for the record will be: Would the committee recall to the stand Mr. Jack L. Warner, of Warner Bros. Studios, and subpoena all pertinent records of Warner Bros. Studios, in order to establish by Mr. Warner's own records that it was at my request and not Mr. Warner's that our association was dissolved early in 1946.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee take the motion under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask whether, in the course of the examination by Mr. Stripling, I may have the opportunity to reply specifically to serious misstatements of fact made by three witnesses last week. I refer specifically to Mr. Jack Moffitt, who made serious misinterpretations about a play on Congress which I have written. I refer specifically to Mr. Morrie Ryskind, who said that the Screen Writers' Guild under my domination, under my leadership, was Communist domination; and I refer very specifically to Mr.

⁶⁹ See appendix, p. 546, for exhibit 83.

Rupert Hughes, who made the serious implication, if not direct charge, that I was a Communist masquerading as a Catholic. And as a Catholic I ask the opportunity to establish in this record how far from the truth Mr. Hughes is. Will I have the opportunity to reply specifically to those three witnesses?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Chair will give you permission to reply to those. That is just why you are here. Charges have been made against you and against your organization.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We subpoenaed the other side, and you are the only one to date, however, willing to come here and be very frank. And it is very refreshing. I will tell you that.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to offer in evidence at this time, if I may, an official transcript of the testimony which I gave to Senator Jack Tenney and the California Joint Fact Finding Committee on Un-American Activities on October 7, 1946, drawing particular attention of the committee to page 283 of the printed text of the report and in particular the remarks of Chairman Tenney, who at that time wrote into the record of this committee that in his opinion—

The CHAIRMAN. Let me ask you: Does this have anything to do with these motions?

Mr. LAVERY. Oh, this is part. In other words, I am moving to offer in the record as evidence before this committee the official transcript before a comparable committee in the State of California, in October 1946, and drawing particular attention to the issue: Am I a Communist, or is the Screen Writers' Guild—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., MONDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1946, 10 A. M.

Chairman TENNEY. The committee will come to order. Let the record show that we have Senator Nelson S. Dilworth, of Hemet; Assemblyman Harold Sawallisch, of Richmond; Assemblyman Fred H. Kraft, of San Diego; and Assemblyman Jack Thompson, of San Jose. I think probably we had better swear the stenographers first, who are going to report the hearing.

(Whereupon Byron Oyler and Carey S. Cowart were sworn in as official reporters.)

Chairman TENNEY. For whom are you reporting?

Mr. JAMES PINO. Mr. Clifton Clay employed me for Mr. Emmet Lavery.

Chairman TENNEY. And you are reporting for whom?

Miss ELLENE RASMUSSEN. Westwood Hills Press.

Chairman TENNEY. The Westwood Hills Press. You are reporting directly for the newspaper; is that correct?

Miss RASMUSSEN. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. It is up to the committee as to what we should do with reference to the other reporter. The committee generally has not pursued the policy of permitting any other reporters to take the transcript. What is your pleasure?

Senator DILWORTH. I move we limit the transcripts to the one official transcript by the sworn reporters on the part of the committee.

Mr. SAWALLISCH. I second the motion.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you include in that motion the reporter for the newspaper?

Senator DILWORTH. There is no objection to newspaper reporters. I don't care how they take it down.

Chairman TENNEY. You are reporting for the newspaper; is that correct?

Miss RASMUSSEN. Will you ask Mr. McNitt?

Chairman TENNEY. Yes.

Mr. FRANK McNITT. Yes. We asked her. She reported for us when your committee had the hearing last January.

Chairman TENNEY. She is a bona fide reporter?

Mr. McNITT. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. For the newspaper; is that right?

Mr. McNITT. That is right.

Senator DILWORTH. What newspaper is it?

Chairman TENNEY. Westwood Hills Press. Your name.

Miss RASMUSSEN. Rasmussen.

Chairman TENNEY. Your first name?

Miss RASMUSSEN. Ellene.

Chairman TENNEY. Miss Ellene Rasmussen?

Miss RASMUSSEN. Yes.

Mr. LAVERY. May I be heard on the motion? My name is Lavery. I am a witness hereunder subpoena. I did not know what the procedure of the committee was. I had hoped for permission to have a full transcript taken of such testimony of mine that the committee might hear on the assumption the committee hears so much testimony that probably in the final report I could not get the full context that I would like.

Chairman TENNEY. May I say to you, Mr. Lavery, the committee has made it a policy for years that any person subpoenaed who may wish to have a copy of the transcript may make an arrangement with the official reporter and get it in that manner. That is the official policy.

Mr. LAVERY. Of course you have to wait a long time to get it.

Chairman TENNEY. No.

Mr. LAVERY. Can you get it on 48 hours' notice?

Chairman TENNEY. No; that is up to the reporter. The committee is always anxious to get the report as soon as possible. You may make arrangements with the official reporter, if the motion carries, and receive it in that manner.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you.

Chairman TENNEY. It has been moved and seconded, moved by Senator Dilworth and seconded by Mr. Sawallisch, that all reporters save the official reporters of the committee and those for the press, be excluded from taking testimony. Is there any discussion? [No response.] All those in favor signify by saying "Aye." Contrary-minded? So ordered. We are sorry. You will have to leave. [Mr. Pino leaves the room.]

All right, Mr. Combs, will you call your list of witnesses subpoenaed for this morning.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Lavery is here. Ellenore Abowitz? William Bidner? Albee Slade. Elliott Wax.

Mr. WAX. Here.

Mr. COMBS. John Stapp. C. B. Horrell.

Chairman TENNEY. I think he is subpoenaed for 2 o'clock.

Mr. COMBS. I think that is all for this morning, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman TENNEY. All right. Call your first witness, Mr. Combs.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Lavery.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you be sworn, sir? (Witness sworn.)

EMMET G. LAVERY, called as a witness by the committee, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

By Chairman TENNEY:

Q. Will you state your full name, Mr. Lavery?—A. Emmet G. Lavery.

Q. Your occupation?—A. I am a writer by profession. I was a lawyer, admitted to the bar of the State of New York in 1925.

Q. Are you presently employed?—A. I am a free-lance writer employed in the making of motion pictures, and I am also a playwright.

Chairman TENNEY. All right, Mr. Combs.

Mr. COMBS. I might state for the record, Mr. Chairman, that the committee did not issue a subpoena for Mr. Lavery because it suspected him of any subversive activities nor because it had any information or suspicion that he was affiliated with any organization such as the Communist Party or any of its component subdivisions. The subpoena was issued to Mr. Lavery more for informative purposes.

The WITNESS. May I say for the record I am delighted at the opportunity to testify before the committee and I hope that the chairman of the committee will find it possible to read into the record, in lieu of an opening statement, a telegram which I sent him yesterday.

Mr. COMBS. I will introduce the telegram as an exhibit in connection with your testimony.

The WITNESS. That is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. COMBS. And attach it to your testimony.

The WITNESS. That is all right.

Chairman TENNEY. I believe, Mr. Combs, it was the policy of the committee in the past not to accept statements except as they are filed with the committee. I believe we will be able to bring out from Mr. Lavery everything you say in the telegram.

The WITNESS. May I renew my request for the sake of the record? I have asked that the formal statement I addressed to the chairman of the committee be introduced into the record along with my testimony.

Chairman TENNEY. All such statements will be accepted and filed with the committee.

The WITNESS. I don't want it filed. I want it in the minutes.

Mr. COMBS. It will be.

The WITNESS. I want it in the public minutes. I want it in the full report.

Chairman TENNEY. It will be attached to the committee records.

The WITNESS. That is not what I asked. I asked will it appear in the printed text of the committee's final report.

Chairman TENNEY. We cannot assure you of anything like that.

The WITNESS. That is why I am renewing my motion. If you deny it for the record that is all right, but I want it clear.

Chairman TENNEY. We want everything in the record under oath.

The WITNESS. I will repeat it under oath right now.

Chairman TENNEY. It has been the policy of the committee to accept any statement which you wish filed. It will be accepted and we will have it as part of our record, but whether it will be in the report is a matter for the committee to decide.

The WITNESS. That is perfectly true.

Chairman TENNEY. Continue Mr. Combs.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Mr. Lavery, your name is Emmet G. Lavery?—A. That is right.

Q. Where did you reside prior to coming to California?—A. I was born and resided for a good many years in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., where I was president of the board of aldermen for two terms. I was city editor of the Poughkeepsie Sunday Courier for 10 years. I practiced law in the city of Poughkeepsie. My family lived there for many years.

Q. About when did you first come to California?—A. I first came to California in 1934.

Q. You have resided here ever since?—A. With a few intervals here. I was here from 1935 to 1937. I was in the East from 1937 to 1941. I returned here in 1941 and have been here ever since, with the exception of a few months in the East at the end of 1942 and the early part of 1943.

Q. Are you affiliated with the Screen Writer's Guild?—A. I am serving my second term as president of the Screen Writer's Guild.

Q. You have been affiliated with it for many years?—A. Yes; I first joined the Screen Writers' Guild when I came to California.

Q. You are familiar, I am sure, with an organization known as the Hollywood Writers Mobilization Committee?—A. I was their wartime chairman.

Q. And, of course, you are acquainted with Mr. Robert Rossen?—A. Yes; I know Robert Rossen.

Q. And John Howard Lawson?—A. Yes; I know John Howard Lawson.

Q. Are you acquainted with Pauline Lauber, sometimes known as Pauline Lauber Finn?—A. Yes; I know Pauline Lauber.

Q. You knew her in 1945; did you not?—A. She was secretary of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization at the time I was chairman.

Q. That was in 1945?—A. Partly in 1945. It may also have been in 1944. I retired as chairman of mobilization in January or February 1946. It was 1945 when I was in mobilization.

Q. Does she still hold any official position with mobilization, to your knowledge?—A. I think she is still executive secretary. At the moment I don't happen to be an officer of mobilization, but I believe she is still its executive secretary.

Q. Do you know how much she received as salary at the time she was secretary in 1945?—A. That I can't say now. I could have told you then, but it is nearly a year since I have been off.

Q. From what source did the funds come from which her salary was paid?—A. Our revenue in the mobilization came through several sources. During the war years the Screen Writers' Guild of Hollywood contributed the sum of \$10,000 annually. I think they did that for 2 years. There was a slight extra appropriation. I think we might have contributed as much as \$24,000. It was our way of doing war service work. There were other sources of revenue for the mobilization. The OWI made available certain expense moneys in return for the preparation of scripts. The Los Angeles Community Chest last year, I believe, was a cosponsor of the work of the mobilization.

Q. How much did you receive from the Community Chest, Mr. Lavery?—A. I can't tell you offhand.

Q. Was it in the neighborhood of twenty some thousand dollars?—A. I think it was in two sums. It might have gone as high as that, but I don't think that high in any one period. It seems to me the initial appropriation was around \$13,000 or \$16,000. I may be wrong about that.

Chairman TENNEY. I think that is correct for 6 months.

The WITNESS. Yes; for a 6-month period.

By Mr. COMBS :

Q. Was any portion of that sum allocated to the payment of Pauline Lauber Finn's salary as executive secretary?—A. Now, I can't say as to that. There were various sources of revenue. What sources paid what bills I couldn't say unless I had the accounts before me.

Q. Are you acquainted with her background at all?—A. No, beyond the fact that she was a very capable secretary. In the mobilization as in the Screen Writers Guild we ask neither the political nor the religious affiliation of any of our employees or members.

Q. I understand that, but the question was to test your own familiarity with her background.—A. No; I don't know what her background is.

Q. Did she go under the name of Pauline Lauber or Pauline Lauber Finn at the time she was employed by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization?—A. I believe her professional name was Pauline Lauber, but we also knew her under her married name, Pauline Lauber Finn.

Q. What, generally, were her duties as executive secretary of mobilization, Mr. Lavery?—A. The correlation of committee work, the supervision of office detail, duties not unlike, say, the executive secretary of the chamber of commerce.

Q. Would she be the official who would have charge of the mailing list of the Hollywood Mobilization?—A. Only incidentally.

Q. She would have access to it, would she not?—A. Anybody on the staff would have access to it mechanically, but the mobilization, no less than the Screen Writers Guild, has always been very careful and very zealous about the use of its membership list.

Q. Do you know whether or not the Hollywood Writers Mobilization used the mailing list of any other organization?—A. I have no knowledge that they did.

Q. At least you had no knowledge of that fact at the time that you were president of the organization?—A. No; but I remember when we premiered the Town Meeting discussion of Tomorrow the World, and we wanted to reach as many people as possible, we may have gone to a wide variety of people in Hollywood and asked them to come—whether or not we had access to their mailing list in the course of that, I don't know.

Q. What position did Pauline Lauber Finn hold in connection with the Screen Writers Guild?—A. I don't think Pauline Lauber had any connection per se with the Screen Writers Guild except that the Guild was definitely a sponsor of the work of the mobilization because that was the channel through which we did our war service work and Mrs. Lauber was executive secretary of the mobilization.

Q. Do you know whether or not she ever held any official position with the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions?—A. I don't know, but I don't recall her name as officer of that committee.

Q. Is your acquaintanceship with Mr. John Howard Lawson casual or intimate?—A. I would say that it was casual, but it has extended over a long period of years. It seems to me I have known Jack Lawson at least 10 years.

Q. You didn't know him in New York?—A. No; I didn't know Jack Lawson in the East.

Q. Is that a social acquaintance or professional or both, Mr. Lavery?—A. It is definitely a professional acquaintance. I met Mr. Lawson as I know Mr. Rossen and as I know most of the people in my profession. I know them as lawyers know lawyers. I know them through the Screen Writers Guild.

Q. You have never visited in Mr. Lawson's home?—A. No; I have never been a visitor in Mr. Lawson's home.

Q. You are a member of the executive council of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee, are you not?—A. I was, briefly. I was a member of the council for some time. I was elected to the executive committee, and the pressure of other work prevented me from serving on the executive committee, and I resigned from the executive committee of the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee, but I am still a member of the committee generally.

Q. You are, I see. Do you recall in October 1943, that the Hollywood Writers Mobilization and the University of California at Los Angeles jointly sponsored a writers congress?—A. Definitely; I was a speaker at it.

Q. Did you have anything to do with making the initial arrangements for that congress?—A. I don't know what you mean by "initial arrangements," but I had quite a little to do with the planning of the schedule as it finally worked out.

Q. No; let me clarify that. By "initial arrangements" I mean contact with the faculty at the University of California at Los Angeles for the purpose of initiating the congress.—A. I don't think I sat in on the preliminary conferences.

Q. Now, there were some articles that appeared in the Hollywood Citizens News concerning yourself. I don't recall just when they were. You are familiar with them, are you not?—A. No; not unless you specify the year.

Q. Well, this year.—A. I must say I have not seen them.

Q. You haven't seen them?—A. But like Mr. Justice Holmes, I get a great deal of comfort out of not reading the newspapers sometimes.

Q. Did you see any articles last year accusing you of being affiliated with a subversive organization?—A. I didn't see them in the Citizens News. Yet I am well aware that those slanders have been repeated on many occasions, and I recently threatened to sue for libel the editor of the Hollywood Reporter if he did not retract them, and as a result of which at his own expense he published a two full page advertisement in which he printed my complete letter of denial, and my affirmation of political and religious faith and my reaffirmation of the fact that I have never had anything to do with Marxian communism.

Q. Mr. Lavery, about when did those articles in the Hollywood Reporter appear?—A. Recently there have been a series. Actually Mr. Wilkerson, the editor of that paper has been embarked on that project for about 10 years. I just happened to be the momentary objective with a few other people. I might say in passing that Miss Myrna Loy is suing him for \$1,000,000.

Q. That is in connection with the Matthew Woll articles?—A. Yes. It is just as libelous as what he printed about me except his publication of the retraction lessened the damage I could collect in the law courts, and that is why he published it.

Q. Is your suit still pending?—A. I see no point at the moment in suing him unless he reiterates the libel.

Q. Your suit— A. I never filed suit. I filed a demand for retraction. Under the laws of California since he published the retraction my damage is lessened; therefore, I have no reason to sue him at the moment.

Q. Have you ever been a subscriber to the People's Daily World?—A. No.

Q. You have no sympathy with Marxian doctrines at all, have you?—A. None at all. I have repeated that on many occasions and I am delighted to do it now. Let me say parenthetically that the difference between me and other people in Hollywood is that I oppose communism in another way. I think the answer to the Communist and Marxian philosophy is to live a better philosophy. Other people go at it differently. That is my theory.

Chairman TENNEY. I would just like to interrupt a second there. Mr. Lavery, I am glad to hear you make that statement. To elaborate on it for the record—

The WITNESS. I will be delighted.

Chairman TENNEY. I don't know how familiar you are with Marxian philosophy, but I think you should know, being a writer, that they hate nothing more than a reformer. A reformer is almost as bad as a Trotskyite, and consequently, to make things better, while that would be desirable, would not appease them in their activities for the destruction of our Government and its institutions. Isn't that correct?

The WITNESS. I would be delighted to elaborate the point. Let me say, frankly, that I take my social essays from the Gospel of the Apostles and not from the essays of Karl Marx. In particular I take my social essays from the encyclicals of Leo XIII. The Catholic Church has a broad affirmative social program which is rather far reaching, very progressive, and very democratic. I believe in it very much. To make it more concrete, my approach to the field of social action

is identical with that of people such as Archbishop Lucey, of San Antonio; Bishop Haas, of Wisconsin; Bishop Shiel, of Chicago. They believe, and I believe the problem at the moment is to integrate Christian ideals, Catholic ideals, broad virtues of good persuasion in the broad life of a democratic community. I see the only real answer to Marxian communism is a live, alert democracy which is trying to put in effect its own social program. The reason, frankly, that I as an individual have never had any great enthusiasm for popular crusades against the Communist menace is because I, personally, believe in this town the menace is very small and that if we confine our opposition to communism to public speeches and public crusades we simply expose ourselves to the dangers that Hitler brought about in Germany where your arbitrarily divide sections of the community, align group against group. You face that futility of trying to decide who is a Communist and who is not and what you mean by communism. It seems to me the great challenge of the moment is to live a democratic life which offers our people everything they can legitimately desire. And so I have tried to apply myself in my life, in my church, and in my plays, particularly my current play on Mr. Justice Holmes—to which I invite this committee to come when it plays in Los Angeles—I believe the challenge is to get out and work in the market place and live a truly American life. I don't see much good to be achieved by debating generalities, which is very easy, and just saying "Down with communism."

Chairman TENNEY. May I ask one other question in connection with that.

Q. As you watch the aggressive imperialist policy of Soviet Russia by diplomatic moves backed up by military threats in its encirclement of all the border countries in Europe and see that paralysis creeping over Europe, how would you combat that?—A. I still think, Senator, the answer is to live a better life at home and live a better life abroad. I think the challenge to civilization at the moment is to put the greatest distance possible between World War II and World War III. I hope with all my heart that we do not have war with Russia.

Q. And so do we all.—A. If we had war with Russia many of us would have naturally to stand for those American principles that we believe in.

Q. Let me interrupt you there.—A. But I think, Senator, the point you are getting at and the point I want to hit is this: How do we increase that peace span between World War II and World War III? If popular irritations, if popular dangers are magnified beyond their true scope, we are not adult people trying to put the greatest distance between World War II and World War III. I believe with the Pope it is a great time for prayer. People who are church-going people should pray for peace. And, incidentally, whether you realize it or not, in Catholic churches every Sunday for many, many years we have prayed for peace with a large section of Russia.

Q. That is quite laudable.—A. May I point out how we do it. At the end of Mass there is a prayer inserted by one of the Popes some years back for a reunion with the Orthodox Russian Church. Every Sunday those prayers are said in every Catholic Church the world over. The Catholic Church believes and works for peace with Russia and so do I if I can get it.

Q. Let me point out this one situation. I would like to have your reaction on that. We find today as we view the situation in Europe the identical situation that developed under Hitler, the encirclement policy, the policy of aggression, the declarations that we are not going to make war. We are seeing in some quarters the same type of appeasement offered to Hitler. Now, do you feel we should do the same thing with Stalin?—A. Senator, that is a difficult question. If I were sitting on the United Nations Council it would not be easy to give an answer to that, "Yes" or "No". All I can say is it puts us on the alert more than ever at home to preserve the democratic society that we have. Even if we grant the developing situation in Europe is one to try the patience of saints and great men, still in trying to get them remedied it seems to me that we throw in the sponge prematurely. If in order to prepare for an emergency, a contingency that has not yet happened, we begin at home to apply the principles of thought control to smooth everything out to a given line, it seems to me more than ever we have to make that democratic life work at home where it is a free interplay of opinions that makes the broad variety of home economic life. If we begin to stamp out all the way along the line then truly we have gone for the Stalin pattern. It seems to me this is the moment when we need the greatest diversity in home life so that everybody can be heard, everybody can be represented in the developing pattern of American life. If we go to the opposite and practically project a wartime situation when there is no war it seems to me that we scrap the democratic pattern even before we have come to this alleged struggle over the democratic pattern.

Q. You recognize communism as an atheistic evil thing in the world, but you minimize its importance in American life; is that substantially it?—A. Senator, that is almost it, but not quite. Let's take a section of life I know about. After all, it doesn't get us very far if we sit here and discuss what we think is right or wrong about the European situation. We are not on the spot and don't know the facts. But take a small segment of American life that I know something about. I have always said and I shall always insist that communism in the Hollywood scene is a small and unimportant minority, and the vast majority of people who work in the picture industry are not Communists, have nothing to do with communism, and have been needlessly smeared in Congress and—

Chairman TENNEY. Our committee has said that many times. We believe the great majority of people are loyal Americans. But we saw in the developments before Hitler, the fifth columnists marching in this country with their front organizations and extending great influence just as the Communists do. They follow the same technique. That is something you should not overlook. But we are getting too far afield if we get into a general philosophic discussion. I think you had better proceed, Mr. Combs.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Mr. Lavery, you have been engaged in writing in the motion-picture field ever since you came to California?—A. Oh, yes—not continuously—but off and on since 1935.

Q. Were you ever regularly employed by any one studio?—A. Oh, yes; many times. When I first came out here I was under contract with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer. Later I worked for Columbia. When I returned in 1941 I was under contract with RKO. Since then I have been under contract to Walter Wanger and to Warner Bros. At the moment I am an independent free lance.

Q. How long have you been a free lance, about?—A. Oh, since perhaps February or March of the last year, previous March.

Q. Is your anti-Communist sentiment generally known among the writing fraternity?—A. I think so. Nobody in Hollywood motion pictures—I shouldn't say nobody, but most people in the Hollywood picture industry have no doubts as to where I stand.

Q. You have never endeavored to make it a secret, have you?—A. All I can say my plays speak for themselves.

By Chairman TENNEY:

Q. You do know that John Howard Lawson is considered one of the outstanding Marxian Communists on the Pacific coast?—A. I am aware that that has been represented.

Q. I don't think he has ever denied it.—A. No; I don't suppose he has.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Mr. Lavery, have you ever given any thought to the allegation that has been made many, many times, for example, by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that there are people in authority such as the United States Attorney General and others say that while the Communist Party in the United States may have given up its idea or its goal of achieving a revolution in this country, that the truly indoctrinated Communist minority, that hard, disciplined corps of Communist functionaries, small but quite potential nevertheless, are of considerable use to the Soviet Union along the lines of espionage? Have you ever considered that?—A. Speculatively, yes. Dramatically I suppose we have all considered it.

Q. Let me call your attention to a development we found recently. In our Oakland hearing which we concluded a week ago Thursday we introduced into the record photostatic copies of the minutes of the executive committee of an organization known as the International Federation of Architects, Engineers, Chemists, and Technicians, a CIO union. That union was started in New York in 1933. Its president since 1937 has been a member of the Communist Party, not an inferred member, but the proof is available in written form. The national organizer for the union, Marcel Surer, ran for alderman in the city of New York on the Communist Party ticket. The organization, locals of which exist in this country and in Canada, comprise scientists, physicists, chemists, and so on. In 1943 in Berkeley, the place where the cyclotron was developed, it was shown by the testimony of this hearing that all but two of the employees in the radiation laboratory were members of this local union in Berkeley. Coincident with the operation of the local in Berkeley, there was operating in San Francisco the Cali-

fornia Labor School, typical of similar ones, analogous to the People's Educational Center, ostensibly a liberal institution for the dissemination of learning to people in the trade-unions. The head of that school, Mr. David Jenkins, testified that he had never been affiliated with the Communist Party, but his memory was refreshed by a copy of a registration ticket in New York which he admitted. He also admitted he had been arrested for Communist agitation. Witnesses testified that he had free access to and from the Soviet Consulate in San Francisco. Teaching in the California Labor School of which he was the director were certain atomic scientists, some of whom have access to the over-all picture of atomic development in the United States. In addition to that, the committee analyzed and read excerpts from the Royal Commissioner's report in Canada where proof was introduced coming from the Soviet Embassy itself that top atomic secrets had been obtained in Canada and in this country. A sample of uranium 235 was flown directly by plane from Ottawa to Moscow, and Igor Suresko, whose job it was to code and decode messages between the ambassador's office in Ottawa and the Soviet Union, took the official documents and made them available for the Canadian authorities. I don't want to go by the mark by citing all this matter which, of course, is in the record and which is substantiated by documentary reports and sworn evidence, but I cite it to show how in a project as important as atomic research infiltration can exist, not because the vast majority of scientists in the United States are Communists, but where, in a strategic place, where information is of value, a very small, compact, well-disciplined, fanatical group can do untold damage. The analogy I am trying to draw is this: In a situation like Hollywood which exercises such a profound and widespread influence on the public, a long-range strategy of penetrating two unions in that industry with the idea of getting control can be productive of equal damage.—A. May I meet that issue head-on?

Q. Yes.—A. I don't know what the situation is in Berkeley. All I know is the situation in Hollywood.

Q. Yes.—A. May I point out in passing that the guilds and unions do not employ people who work in the motion-picture industry. This question in Hollywood gets into a question this committee should not duck if it wants to follow through. What producers and what pictures? Now, look, we don't employ people. If Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer wants to employ a certain writer, or Warner Bros. wants to employ a certain writer, that is the business of those studios. I have not yet in my 19 years' experience in Hollywood found a man who can finance what you would call a Communist picture through Louis B. Mayer or Mr. Sam Katz at Metro. [Laughter.] They are anything but communistic gentlemen. I think the Skourases, the Schenks, and Mr. Zanuck at Twentieth Century-Fox are as alert as this committee to not allow Marxian doctrines in pictures. It begs the question to ask, What are the guilds or the unions doing about this? For one thing they are not the employers.

Now, another thing. You are probably curious why I do not share immediately your same quality of alarm when a minority with whom we do not agree politically is active in this or that union, I feel the danger is that in peacetime, when we are not yet at war, of trying to liquidate a minority with which we may not agree politically, that we may eliminate a lot of good people along the way. The danger of generalization—

Chairman TENNEY. May I interrupt.

Q. Mr. Lavery, as you probably know, I am past president of local 47 of the American Federation of Musicians, Los Angeles. At the time I was president we had about 8,000 members and I saw 65 Communists take over the local.—A. All I can say is I have not seen any Communists take over the Screen Writers Guild at the present time. And as this committee says, my own Americanism and my faith in this country has not been questioned here. Let me give a specific example of what I mean by the danger of generalization with relation to minority groups. At the risk of being personal let me take a case that has concerned this committee here, a generalization which does a great deal of damage in the life of the community. I take it that all members of the committee are familiar with the Sleepy Lagoon case, *People v. Henry Lewis*. I have been studying the reports of this committee and reading them with a great deal of interest for a long time. I have not been able to find the page yet, but maybe counsel can give it to me, where this committee has taken, shall we say, legislative notice of the fact that what it calls a Communist cause célèbre was unanimously reversed by the district court of appeals, three judges, Thomas P. White writing the opinion—incidentally, a Catholic, of whom all Catholics are proud. Now, nowhere in the committee

reports, even in the 1945 minutes, do I find even a footnote of where it mentioned the reversal.

Mr. COMES. Excuse me. By minutes you mean the 1945 report?

The WITNESS. I mean the 1945 report to the assembly.

By Chairman TENNEY:

Q. The reversal of that case came after the report was published.—A. Oh, no. Let me correct that, Senator. I checked that yesterday. The reversal of the Sleepy Lagoon case came in February 1914 and the volume I am referring to is April 1945.

Q. That was the date it was submitted to the legislature. I think you are going far afield there because the real point was that the Communists made it a cause célèbre.—A. But aren't you going to give the judiciary of California credit for clearing up the case? The defendants were released.

Q. Do you realize many of them were arrested again and convicted of other crimes?—A. I realize that. But in what minutes do you intend to footnote the fact that the Appellate Court of California found the evidence was so slim and flimsy that in the unanimous opinion of the judges the decision was reversed? The reason I hear down on the Sleepy Lagoon case is this—

Q. That was not the issue. The issue was initiated by Mrs. LaRue McCormick, a known Communist functionary.—A. What has that to do with whether people are guilty or innocent? We don't decide on the basis of that. That is the point in this case. That is the crucial point I want to argue with the Committee today. I am not a Communist. I believe the Sleepy Lagoon case is a perfect example of how a lot of community hate can be engendered in the treatment of a particular case, and the Appellate Court of California comes along and reverses the case and the prosecution releases the defendants. And, I say, as a taxpayer, as a member of the bar of the State of New York, and a man interested in due process and the judicial philosophy of law, that it is time the committee footnoted the fact that the Appellate Court of California took a different viewpoint.

Q. The viewpoint on the facts the committee went into. That is the point. Now, I supported Tom Mooney in his efforts to be released from San Quentin. I didn't think that Tom Mooney was ever guilty of the crime for which he was convicted, but I know the Communist Party used it in their program of agitation.—A. Suppose they did do it?

Q. But not for the purpose I was working for, to see justice done. They were using it for the purpose of recruiting people into the Communist Party, following out Lenin's admonition to use every grievance and every abuse.—A. I won't argue with that. But suppose the Communist Party used the Sleepy Lagoon case for their particular purpose? Is that any reason why this committee should not at every opportunity quote the full facts about the Sleepy Lagoon case so that when scholars in the future work down that index, Senator, they will get the full story? The passing reader can go right straight through those reports and up until this year repeated emphasis is made by witnesses that people were convicted, convicted, convicted. No reference is made to the fact that on appeal it was thrown out.

Q. I understand your feeling in the matter, but I don't think it is important for the fact that our committee was interested in the activities behind it.—A. Don't you think it is important to the judges of California?

Q. That case is on record in the records of the State in court decisions.—A. But you quote it as a conviction after it has been reversed by the appellate court, which is an injustice to Justice Tom White and the other justices. There should be some notation.

Q. I don't think the committee ever mentioned the fact that Tom Mooney had been released and pardoned by Governor Olson. I think those are matters of common knowledge. The point we are interested in is the mandate of the legislature to investigate Communist agitation and subversive activities. It may be the men are perfectly innocent. We don't know. But the point we are interested in is what are the Communists doing with it and how they are utilizing it.—A. You used it for the alleged guilt to clinch that argument of your case. It wouldn't have been half so good a case if you did not refer to the 16 convictions. I say you should quote the whole way. That is the danger of generalization. When people come along and find the case was reversed later on appeal they will say, "Which way was it?" It may be, as the Senator says, they used that case for their own purposes, but what about the objective guilt or innocence of the people concerned there and what about the full story for the scholars later who will come along and get only half of the picture?

Q. Those scholars will go to the California Reports and the Supreme Courts.—
A. Is there any attempt at correlation between the legislative and judicial benches of government in California?

Q. Not in that respect. We can't do anything there, I know. I don't think it is incumbent upon this committee, and it couldn't be done until the decision was written because that part of the report was written prior to the reversal. As a matter of fact, as chairman I did not hear about it until after—A. Could I, simply as a friendly neighbor, in justice to the three justices who wrote that opinion, ask that at some time it be entered on the minutes?

Chairman TENNEY. We would have no objection to that.

Mr. COMBS. I am confident in the next issue of the report which will cover the last 2 years, that if the evidence at least here develops as we anticipate it will, that will be mentioned in the report.

The WITNESS. I just feel it should have been mentioned sooner. I spent all of Sunday—

Mr. COMBS. It wasn't decided yet.

The WITNESS. February 1944, and the last report was 1945.

Mr. COMBS. Yes; but our report was not written then.

The WITNESS. It was submitted to the legislature—I have it right here—April 16, 1945.

Chairman TENNEY. That was before the statement.

Mr. COMBS. It was written long before that.

The WITNESS. Not a year before. Six months before. Even so the court of appeals had a 3 months' head start.

Chairman TENNEY. So that you will feel all right about it we will take care of that at the next printing.

The WITNESS. All right. I am sorry I interrupted.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. We were interested in the zoot-suit riots down here, and Mrs. McCormick testified under oath she was a member of the Communist Party and she conceived the idea of creating a Citizens Committee for the Defense of Mexican-American Youth.—A. Have you gone into that side of the picture?

Q. Yes; we have.—A. What I mean by the other side of the picture, are you aware there is at least one radio station in this town, a member of the national hook-up, which is firmly of the opinion that a great deal of those zoot-suit riots were precipitated by a newspaper which I shall not mention at this point?

Q. Yes; we are aware of that.—A. And also the situation was so grave, and so thoroughly did the radio station believe it was newspaper-inspired that they put on a special program on the air, These Are Americans, in order to counteract it. That radio station took an opposite point of view. Irrespective of what the Communist point of view might have been, that radio station representing good, sound Americans decided a certain newspaper in this town was stimulating this anything beyond all due proportion and it took action accordingly. I don't find anything in the minutes of this committee that shows what that radio station did yet. I take it it does not care. In fact, they are rather proud of it.

Chairman TENNEY. Have you noticed we published in the report and gave dates, column and page numbers of the People's Daily World, the California Eagle, and Al Waxman's Eastside Journal, which preceded these riots by months, and we have testimony on it.

The WITNESS. Did you quote the Hearst press?

Mr. COMBS. Yes; we did.

Chairman TENNEY. Yes; we did.

The WITNESS. As thoroughly as the others?

Mr. COMBS. No; not as thoroughly.

Chairman TENNEY. We found Al Waxman as editor of his paper was holding meetings with his boys and was inciting them to violence against the police, and at the same time he was going to the police department every morning demanding that they take action against these zoot-suiters. There you had a situation which we proved beyond a shadow of a doubt the agitational methods involved.

The WITNESS. By my training at Fordham Law School—maybe the Irish are a little peculiar—

Chairman TENNEY. I am Irish, too.

Mr. COMBS. So am I.

The WITNESS. It wasn't a good case unless you had both sides. There is another side to the zoot-suit thing. I am not trying to say that is the right side,

although I have a belief about it, but nevertheless as I read the minutes I find a lot about the California Eagle and other papers, but I find very little about Mr. Hearst. Now, why hasn't this committee ever subpoenaed the radio station that put on that program and asked them what they thought about it, why they felt it was so necessary to counteract the agitation, and what was the true origin of those riots?

Chairman TENNEY. We went into that, Mr. Lavery, and did not find any of that agitation.

The WITNESS. The radio station was convinced of the opposite. You can subpoena them tomorrow and they will tell you.

Chairman TENNEY. If you go back—and we will be glad to go back—if you can find any editorials in the Hearst press or in the metropolitan press prior to the riots we will be glad to have it. But we can show you dozens from all of these radical newspapers in which they were agitating the question. That is a part of Communist technique. I would certainly recommend that you read some of these books on Communist technique to understand what they do.

The WITNESS. Senator, I assure you I am not a freshman when it comes to a study of Communist technique. I have observed them for a good many years. I have said that our difference is one of methodology: how best to combat the evils that concern us.

Mr. COMBS. Isn't that the whole difference?

The WITNESS. Yes; because in a democracy the test is the means that men choose to get the means. It makes a lot of difference what methods you pursue. I insist with respect to the one guild which I think I am an authority on, the Screen Writers Guild, that time after time the actions and the thinking of 10 or 12 people at the outside—it never gets past 10 or 12—are used to smear the good work of a thousand active members and 400 associate members. I have insisted many times, and the voting record of my guild shows, we are a rather conservative guild. We are not a radical guild. We are conservative. And most of the motions will show it. Yet, time after time, the actions or thinking of a small minority are quoted and transferred to the thinking of the majority. In a situation like this where we are not even really the employers, instead of talking to me you should be talking to Louis B. Mayer, Darryl Zanick, and Henry B. Warner.

By Mr. COMBS:

Q. Suppose we take a somewhat hypothetical case. Assume you prepare a script or story adaptation and submit it to one of the studios and it is purchased. Does that go to the Screen Writers Guild first?—A. Not necessarily. It is true the vast bulk of the story material that comes to a studio for analysis is not submitted to the guild, but is submitted to readers in the studios. I think most of the readers are members of the Screen Story Analysts Guild, but a great deal of the material is submitted directly by an agent to the producer. I would say on a rough guess that probably 70 percent of the material might come through the reader's department, but 30 percent, and the important 30 percent, is direct personal agent to producer. And for your information, at M-G-M, I understand on good authority, the stories are told to the producers somewhat in the fashion of minnesingers. The stories are not read; a very fine storyteller chooses them.

Q. Then after the story is told, what happens to it?—A. On most lots it is circulated to producers, and if they feel like showing an interest in it, they do. That is not the way most of the top productions are made. What happens in the average case is that they have a great fondness for the best books of the month, for the best books of the year, which are submitted in galley proof in advance of publication by an individual agent to a studio. They are considered with particular emphasis on the stars available to play them. It is more on the basis of star availability and directorial interest than anything else that they finally make a decision as to what scripts they want to do.

Q. Assuming the story is translated into a particular interest and the decision has been made, then what is the mechanics of putting that story into shooting script form?—A. Every studio has a number of contract writers, people working 40 weeks out of 52, or 30 weeks out of 52 a year, whom they can assign to the preparation of that material. Or, like myself, I am a free lance now. It often happens the studio goes outside of and contracts to get a special man in a special field that they feel can do better than anyone else. But the writers and readers have very little choice about either initiating or deciding those matters.

Q. That is what I wanted to bring out.—A. That is the producer's function.

Q. When you finally arrive at the point where the shooting of a script is to be made, would the free-lance writer also write the story of the script?—A. Yes. It all depends on the availability of the particular person you want. The large studios carry a large contract. I suppose Metro has a large number of contract writers. Warners has a substantial list, and so has Twentieth Century. But they also loan writers between studios.

Q. But in the average case or in the majority of cases, once the galley proofs are submitted and accepted and the stars are available, either a regularly employer writer—A. That is right.

Q. Or a free-lance writer is assigned to the job—A. That is right.

Q. Of writing the shooting script.—A. And usually regiments it. It goes on like the 40-mule team on the borax ad. They think the more people who work on it, the better. So in Metro you can find scripts where as many as 15 different writers have gone to work on a script, each rewriting what the last man before him has written.

Q. Now, there is a Screen Analysts Guild, isn't there?—A. Yes.

Q. And there is a Screen Readers Guild, isn't there?—A. It seems to me the Screen Analysts Guild is the Screen Readers Guild.

Q. And a Screen Writers Guild?—A. That is right.

Q. Are there any other guilds that have to do with the transmutation of an original story into a picture?—A. The guilds don't have anything to do about the transposition of a story into a picture. I think you are right; the writers and readers, then there is the Screen Directors Guild and the Screen Actors Guild, all of which play a vital part, you might call it, in the relations between the actor and the studio, the director and the studio, and the writer and the studio. Incidentally, that is where the Screen Writers Guild comes in. We have no control of their scripts.

Q. That is a very important point for our record at this point.—A. We are an unaffiliated guild. We are not CIO or A. F. of L. We are affiliated with the Authors League of America. We were duly constituted the official bargaining agency for the writers some years ago in a duly certified NLRB election. We do not have what you call a closed shop. It is about 90 percent minimum basic agreement between writers and the studios, under which contract certain terms of work are governed, hours, conditions at the studios, arbitration of story credits. But we as a guild have no control over anybody's story material, either from the producer or through the individual writer.

Q. About how large is the guild at the present time?—A. We have about a thousand active members and 400 associate members. Roughly we correspond on the screen to the Dramatists Guild in the theater or the Authors Guild in the field of the novel.

Q. Is there any distinction between the members of the guild—those who are full-time studio employees and those who are free-lancing?—A. Oh, no. There is a distinction between associate and active members.

Q. What is that distinction?—A. Well, that distinction—let's put it the other way around, in terms of the active member. An active member of the Screen Writers Guild is a man or woman who has worked for 26 weeks in the motion-picture industry or who has had a screen play credit, or two original story credits. An associate member of our guild is a person usually working in the industry who does not qualify yet for active membership, and who has no vote in the guild. Some years back the rules for an associate membership in the guild were loose and informal. People who had a friendly interest in pictures, whether actually working in them or not, came in and had no vote, and still have no vote.

Q. Tell me this, Mr. Lavery. When an original application is made for affiliation with the guild, how is that application for membership acted upon?—A. Why, it comes before the board of the Screen Writers Guild and with very few exceptions people seldom have been refused admission to the guild. In other words, we operate on the proposition of everybody belonging, and so do the producers. We are not operating on the principle of trying to keep people out. If a man qualifies for active membership, we want him in.

Q. What are the grounds for refusing application?—A. Actually I know of only one case in recent years and that was not pushed through to a final conclusion. I remember Howard Emmett Rogers filed an application for membership in the Screen Writers Guild. The board at that time said it would like to talk to Mr. Rogers about his reasons for suddenly joining because for years he went up and down the country telling everybody we were nothing but Communists, so

frankly the board had a question about the sincerity of his application. It did not dispose of it finally. It suggested he come to a meeting of the membership committee of the board, but he never appeared at it.

Q. Mr. Rogers is employed by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer?—A. That is right.

Q. What is his status now?—A. I don't know. I think he is still on the pay roll there. I have no doubt he will be before this committee sometime or other. For many years Mr. Rogers has seen Communists under every bed and under every camera. He was an active member in the group defeated in the bargaining election years ago to see who would represent the writers in this town—the company union which the companies favored or the Screen Writers Guild which the majority favored. Mr. Rogers was defeated in that election. A good many people have since come into the guild. Mr. Rogers filed application for membership, which was referred to the board, but he never appeared.

Q. About how long ago was that? When was that application filed?—A. My guess would be a year and a half ago. It was some time back.

Chairman TEXNEY. I would like to ask a question, Mr. Combs.

Q. Mr. Lavery, is Albert Maltz a member of the Screen Writers Guild?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Are you familiar with the controversy that started when Mr. Maltz made a statement which was published in the Nation in reference to journalistic and artistic creations in which he said he felt a book might be written without the use of the Marxian dialectic? It apparently kicked up a lot of fuss in Hollywood and ran in the People's Daily World and I think Albert Maltz finally recanted and said that all journalistic endeavors should be carried forward with art as a weapon. Are you familiar with that controversy?—A. I am not familiar with that particular controversy, but I am familiar with a great number of Albert Maltz' plays. I am rather familiar with the last novel he published, The Cross and the Arrow, which incidentally is a novel of postwar Germany with a very intense spiritual appeal.

Q. He finally came to the conclusion that John Howard Lawson and the other Marxists were correct; that no writing of any kind, whether it be motion pictures or for any entertainment, could possibly be an artistic creation unless written into it was the class struggle, class consciousness, and the other dialectic principles of Marx.—A. That may be the Communist point of view. I don't know if Albert Maltz is a Communist. All I can say is in a guild of a thousand active members we all have a wide variety of thoughts about how we would do a script.

Q. Isn't it true most of the Communists make most of the noise?—A. They make most of the noise, but they don't make most of the script.

Q. What about Sillen?—A. What about Sillen?

Q. This chap Sillen?—A. That is a new one to me. How do you spell it?

Q. S-i-l-l-e-n.—A. I don't know.

Q. Mike Gold. He is a member, is he?—A. We have some Golds. I don't think Michael—it seems to me there are several people with the name of Gold in the guild.

Q. Michael Gold was a delegate to the Kharkov Conference in Russia, out of which came the American Writers League. Are you a member of that group?—A. No; I am not. Let me say my affiliations are rather limited. I believe a man can take on only a few things at a time. I am president of the Screen Writers Guild. I was wartime chairman of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization. I am currently a member of the Hollywood Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions. That is the extent of my affiliations, except I am founder of the National Catholic Theater Conference and am rather proud of the fact; that organization was established in 1937.

Mr. COMBS. May I say this for the record. We find a tendency in the motion-picture industry, for a great many people are sincere liberals, and certainly are not Communists, or by any stretch of the imagination pro-Communist—we find among those people a tendency to lend their names as sponsors and contributors to a vast multitude of assorted organizations. I can say that we don't find your name in that category.

The WITNESS. However, may I say this: The reason you don't find my name on a lot of these is because I try to be a little selective. You can only do so much in 24 hours. But in this community it is the inclination of people to participate in a wide variety of community activities, which I think is very commendable. It would be much more to the shame of Hollywood if they stayed at home in their ivory towers and swimming pools and took no concern of what was going on in the world.

Mr. COMBS. Our criticism, Mr. Lavery—or, at least, mine—is not to the number that they affiliate with; it is the fact they do not pay any attention to investigating the organizations before they affiliate with them.

The WITNESS. May I say to that, we are now living at a time, and you must know on this committee, we have a tendency to accuse being Communist anything we may not happen to agree with politically.

Mr. COMBS. Not this committee.

The WITNESS. No.

Chairman TENNEY. I want to interrupt there to say you are a Fascist if you don't go along with these things, too.

The WITNESS. Well, suppose we grant that. The inclination is to call a man a Fascist in some quarters as readily as a Communist in other quarters. I would like to refer this committee to a series of letters I have written for the Tidings, the Catholic diocese paper of Los Angeles, in which I have tried to analyze what is the responsibility of a man, a Catholic, in what I call a mixed society, in groups, guilds, and unions, where you don't meet people of the same beliefs, religious, political, or what have you. If the inference is to be in this country that one withdraws from every guild where a question has ever been used or raised about their ultimate purpose, then obviously the field of action is going to be left to the status quo boys.

Mr. COMBS. That is very true. I think you are right.

Chairman TENNEY. I agree with you.

The WITNESS. But here in Hollywood, it seems to me in your crusades against committees merely on say-so's, the result is you will drive out people who are not only actual book holders in the Communist Party, but you will drive out all honest, liberal, progressive people as well who believe in social change.

Mr. COMBS. I think you are right.

Chairman TENNEY. Let me add there, Mr. Lavery—let me point out for the sake of the record—that up through your history in the Hollywood motion-picture Democratic Committee, which undoubtedly was Communist dominated and inspired—

The WITNESS. That, I deny, because I was affiliated with them.

Chairman TENNEY (continuing). Let me point out to you Melvyn Douglas and several other people at the time of the Hitler-Stalin pact resigned from the organization because of its Communist character. Then it became the Hollywood Democratic Committee, the same group. And now it is the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee for the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, which every investigating committee has looked into and has declared it to be a Communist organization or a Communist front organization. Let me differentiate. This committee knows probably better than anyone else that a Communist front organization is composed, for the greater part, of good American citizens who have no knowledge of the Communist control and direction of the organization.

The WITNESS. I would like to hit that right on the nose. I would like to meet that issue squarely as the Senator raises it. I will give you a thought from Mr. Justice Holmes again: "When the going gets tough, we should think things instead of words." One of the greatest weasel words in modern law is Communist front, because, the truth of the matter is, it destroys organization. Now, let me follow through, Senator. There is hardly an organization in the average life of an average big city in this country to which you could not apply Communist front on the theory there was one Communist in it.

Chairman TENNEY. I disagree with you. A Communist front organization is characterized by the fact its secretary and board of directors are controlled by the Communists. You and I were members of Communist front organizations. I didn't know it at the time, but I know it now. I was told for years that the National Lawyers Guild was a Communist front organization. I was in Chicago when a resolution was introduced to condemn nazism, fascism, and communism. They were not willing to condemn communism, and 3,000 lawyers threatened to disaffiliate because of it.

The WITNESS. Let's take two organizations. I have been identified with the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee in its current form.

Chairman TENNEY. They would use you because of your reputation.

The WITNESS. Just a second, Senator. I have sat in on board meetings. I was not part of the first one, but I was a member of the last one. I have sat in on meetings there, and I didn't see, even on the basis of hearsay testimony, any preponderance of Communist thought or control. Now, I want to leave this thought with you—

Chairman TENNEY. Before you do that—

The WITNESS. I don't want to get away from that. I want to stick right on it with you, Senator, because, believe me, that is the big challenge of today.

Chairman TENNEY. Here is the point. I don't like to interrupt, but I want to bring this to your mind so that you can formulate your answer to it.

By Chairman TENNEY:

Q. You don't read the People's Daily World?—A. Not very often.

Q. And you don't read the Communist publications, and if you don't do that you can't know what the Communist Party line is. I do read them.—A. Senator, I am surprised at you. If you keep that up you will be affected by it.

Q. No; because I believe I read it objectively. I don't think I am influenced by anything unless I have the facts behind it. But the outstanding, almost amazing, fact is that these organizations never, never disagree with the Communist Party line. That couldn't be coincidental.—A. May I hit that question right on the nose? Senator, as a Catholic, day after day, I meet this question. It is discussed in our churches all the time. It gets down to something as simple as this: Shall we be only for those things the Communists oppose? Now, look at the situation you are in. If the Communist Party says two and two are four, and we know it to be so, shall we oppose it? If the Communist Party comes out for the FEPC shall the Catholic Archbishop of Los Angeles come out and say, "No; it is Communist"? Obviously, in a democracy the Communists are smart enough from time to time to stand for a good thing. If we are going to determine other than by objective truth against who is for and who is against, we are in for a three-ring circus and we will never get the truth.

Q. Let me point out that what you say is partly true. After all, the Communists pick up abuses and grievances and magnify them.—A. Is that bad?

Q. As far as being good, it is all right, because it does some good. We want to see things better. They want to make it worse. The real test is this: For instance, when the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League was organized by V. J. Jerome and John Howard Lawson and other Communists, it was a good organization as far as the average American citizen is concerned, because they were against the persecution of the Jews and the barbaric treatment of people in central Europe. That was fine. But suddenly Stalin and Hitler got together. Now, the real Communists went along with the new line. All of the innocent and good American citizens immediately dropped out. The Hollywood Anti-Nazi League folded up. Then it became the American Peace Mobilization. They began to say, "The Yanks are not coming." Picket lines went around the White House. Roosevelt was a warmonger. It was an imperialist war. Every decent member in the membership got out, but the real Communists stuck right down the line, and the Communist front organizations followed that line through.—A. But that is ancient history. We are dealing with contemporary history.

Q. But we have to go back to some facts we know about in order to apply them to conditions that we are not so familiar with.—A. As lawyers, are you going to be bound by the dead hand of precedent because something happened in Hollywood 5 years ago?

Q. Not at all.

Mr. COMBS. Does a lawyer have to be bound by precedent?

The WITNESS. No; not if you are a good lawyer. Sometimes you make your own precedent if you are a good judge and a good lawyer fighting for the truth. I think the current trial at Nuremberg was a good thing. If it had to wait for the dead hand of precedent it would never have been held.

Mr. COMBS. You would have to wait for a long time.

The WITNESS. I know; but I want to raise this question with the committee. After all, let's be realistic in this thing. As a Catholic, I have been called both a dupe and a dope for being president of the Screen Writers Guild. Those names don't bother me a bit. I was brought up as a lawyer to look for the objective truth as I see it and not to weigh the issues who is for or against, because if you do you become so objective you cannot make an intelligent appraisal of events. In this town right now, in the Screen Writers Guild, in the mobilization, and in the independent citizens' committee, there are honest people who are not being hoodwinked.

Chairman TENNEY. We are sure of that.

The WITNESS. I know, Senator; but particularly after your committee has been in session for a long time, it is the feeling that those of us who linger overlong in progressive groups are being fooled. Believe you me, I would rather stay home than go to guild meetings every month, but I consider it part of my

obligation as an American citizen to pitch in and fight for social justice and social change within the framework of our Constitution. But if we are going to tab every questionable organization as a Communist-front organization, in time you will drive out the Communists, but you will drive out a good 30 percent of solid American citizens along with them, and I think it will be a tragedy in this country.

Chairman TENNEY. May I say, Mr. Lavery, that as soon as the Communists fulfill their objectives they dissolve.

The WITNESS. Then on that basis the Screen Writers Guild should be eliminated.

Chairman TENNEY. We are not talking about it. We never said the Screen Writers Guild is a Communist organization.

The WITNESS. Witnesses have been here. What about private conversation of people who were up here?

Chairman TENNEY. We have said many times, and we say again, your organization has a lot of Communists in it. You know it, and I know it.

The WITNESS. Yes; but—

Chairman TENNEY. But we don't say the organization is Communist because of that reason.

The WITNESS. I want to repeat that, and I will put it in large letters in the Screen Writer.

Mr. COMBS. Nor have we called you a Communist.

The WITNESS. I have been waiting for a long time to get a statement. I see now the Senator's test of a Communist-front organization is one which comes into life quickly and is dissolved quickly.

Chairman TENNEY. No. Let me give you a full definition. A Communist-front organization has for its core a group of Communist functionaries who have been indoctrinated in Communist schools. They go out and get good people who don't know anything about its Communist affiliation. They address these organizations with these names. They have used me, and they probably have used you. All right. Then the organization goes along, and the good members, the American members, don't pay too much attention to it. The directors run it. The Communist Party tells them what to do, and they carry it out. But the test is this: Through their public enunciations they follow the party line. I will be glad if you can show me any time where HICCASP has disagreed with Joe Stalin or the foreign policy of Soviet Russia on the current Communist line; then I will go along with you.

The WITNESS. On a certain point you will have to amend your definition, because at certain times you could prove the Pope himself was a fellow traveler.

Chairman TENNEY. No, Mr. Lavery; I said consistently, without deviation.

The WITNESS. All right. Consistently, without deviation.

Chairman TENNEY. The true liberal is this: He will go along with the Communist Party for a long time because invariably they pick out things that form an impact on the public conscience; but occasionally when they get into conflict with the interests of our own people, say, the foreign policy of Soviet Russia, and the Byrnes policy at Paris, bringing the troops back from China to help the Communist Chinese overthrow the Chinese Government—when those things run contrary to the American conscience, the liberal has to leave them. The point I am making is that the Communist-front organization never deviates from the principles of Marxism or the conscience of Joe Stalin. They follow it very consistently.

The WITNESS. One point I want to raise with respect to the Senator's definition: Who, short of the Supreme Court at Washington, will decide what you mean by "Communists"?

Chairman TENNEY. Referring to Mr. Justice Holmes, I could quote you a few things he said about communism. I think you will find some quotations in the 1943 report.

The WITNESS. I am talking about a contemporary definition of communism. In other words, let's face it. My grandfather, an Irish immigrant, came to the Hudson Valley in New York State around 1860 or 1850 when the Know-Nothing Party was running up and down that valley. In those days to be a Catholic was a dangerous and subversive thing. He sat up nights with a gun on his knee trying to protect the church against night-raiding Know-Nothings. I heard the story as a boy, and I have never forgotten it. Now, I say to myself, as a Catholic who believes in democratic American ideals, the wheels can turn very quickly. Half of the things you receive in this committee against the Communists can be

applied tomorrow in the hands of a committee not so zealous against Catholics very easily.

Chairman TENNEY. Would Mr. Foster be an authority?

The WITNESS. On communism he may be.

Chairman TENNEY. We have just got page after page of quotations.

The WITNESS. Yes. But this country will not confine itself to learning these definitions set up by William Z. Foster. You are in politics. I ran for Congress and lost, happily enough. In politics we must realize the traffic of the ordinary phrase. When people talk about communism and Communist-front organizations they are not careful enough to keep Foster's definition in mind; when they say Communist they mean anything they don't agree with. I may be a Communist today, a Catholic tomorrow. And as a Catholic who wants to see social liberties protected for all of us Catholics I feel it requires extraordinary alertness to see that these things aren't used to wash out people because of so-called political differences.

Chairman TENNEY. Would you apply that to Mr. Gerald L. K. Smith and the Fascists? You have already said or agreed that communism was an evil atheistic thing.

The WITNESS. Let me correct it.

Chairman TENNEY. This committee says—

The WITNESS. May I correct the dialogue, Senator. That is your dialogue, not mine. My specific quote was: "I am opposed to the principles of Marxist communism, and I take my social thinking from the Encyclicals of Leo XIII on that question." I didn't use that dialogue. That is yours.

Chairman TENNEY. Do you think it is an evil thing?

The WITNESS. I don't think it is a good thing.

Chairman TENNEY. Therefore, if it is not good it must be evil, is that a reasonable conclusion?

The WITNESS. Except that you and I are strange people to decide what is good and evil. I am objective enough, according to Mr. Justice Holmes' philosophy, to say the way I was brought up with my faith, both political and religious. I don't believe Marxian communism is a desirable thing. I don't like it for this country. But to characterize in the world at large what is good and evil, I hesitate to do that. I suppose you could say the basic inference of my attitude is that Marxian communism is an evil thing. I hate to sound like a demagogue. "That is an evil thing." It sounds like a Fourth of July speech.

Chairman TENNEY. You do know that as a prerequisite to being a Communist you must be an atheist. Foster has stated that on many occasions. Of course, the Constitution of Soviet Russia points that out also. Therefore, you being a Catholic would be opposed to any propagandization of atheism.

The WITNESS. I have stated that unequivocally.

Chairman TENNEY. Have you read the present encyclicals of the Holy Father in reference to communism?

The WITNESS. Yes, indeed.

Chairman TENNEY. Have you read the recent statement published by the recent Cardinal Glennon after his trip from Europe; have you read that?

The WITNESS. Yes.

Chairman TENNEY. It is my opinion and I think the opinion of the members of this committee that Catholicism stands today as the greatest bulwark against Fascism, atheistic Communist encirclement.

The WITNESS. Yes but on the European scene that is a terrific oversimplification of the picture. In Europe the struggle in many sections is a struggle between Catholicism and communism, but it is a Catholicism the like of which this committee has seldom met face to face. I would say the Christian Democrats in Italy and the MPR in France would not have an easy time before this committee. That is a militant, progressive movement, living the encyclicals. That is not a status quo system. That is a wonderful kind of Catholicism. This committee should not be under any delusions when it says the clash in Europe is between communism and Catholicism. Let's face it. The clash is between two very active kinds of faith. That is not status quo Catholicism, and people should not get that concept in this country. They should know what kind of Catholicism it is. It is a very militant and progressive kind. Truly, there is only one kind of Catholicism. Don't misunderstand me, but it is a Catholicism that is out in the market place, living the Gospel, living the philosophy of social change. It is not the conservative stay-at-home, go-to-church-once-a-Sunday, and don't-read-the-encyclical Catholicism.

Chairman TENNEY. Have you read any pamphlets and books written and published by Father Feely of the San Francisco University, his book *Fascism*? Have you read that?

The WITNESS. No; but let me say, Senator, let's get in the record——

Chairman TENNEY. I want to try to reconcile what might seem to be, at least, in the record, a sort of apology for the Communists.

The WITNESS. No, Senator. I resent that clearly.

Chairman TENNEY. Will you clarify that?

The WITNESS. This is no apology. What I am trying to outline and demarcate for you is the fact that Catholicism is Catholicism applied; it is the Catholicism of Archbishop Sheil of Chicago, it is the Catholicism of Archbishop Lucey of San Antonio, it is the Catholicism of Pope Leo XIII and Pope Pius XII, of Jacques Maritain at the Vatican and the Christian Democrat Von Stertz. Let's get it straight, once and for all. I am not an apologist for communism. I don't want to define the degree of my Catholicism. I feel it would be presumptuous. But can we get it in the record for once? I have two plays now in rehearsal at the Vatican. If that doesn't satisfy the Senator I don't know what will.

Chairman TENNEY. It does. You have put it in a negative way, and the conclusion is properly drawn that you believe communism to be an evil thing, but you minimize the activities of these individuals and the strategy and techniques which have been worked out by Lenin, by Stalin, by the outstanding contemporary Communist leaders in the United States for very definite purposes.

The WITNESS. Let me say this, I think we are much closer right at this moment in this country as well as elsewhere to fascism than to communism.

Chairman TENNEY. What is the difference, Mr. Lavery?

The WITNESS. I think if you will get Gerald L. K. Smith on the stand you will get the difference tomorrow.

Chairman TENNEY. I see no difference.

The WITNESS. I have spoken to Gerald L. K. Smith. Why don't you subpoena him and ask him for yourself? I think he will give you quite a lot of dissension. [Applause.]

Chairman TENNEY. I want to admonish the audience that demonstrations are not permitted. We are glad to have you here and want you to stay, but if you continue to go into demonstrations we will have to ask you to leave. I want to say that this committee has gone into the activities of Gerald L. K. Smith. The committee has no use for Gerald L. K. Smith or his ilk. We have condemned anti-Semitism. We have condemned every Fascist activity just as we have condemned the activities of subversive groups and the Communists. The chairman of this committee has had letters from Gerald L. K. Smith. He said he would be glad to come. Mr. Smith wants publicity. We don't feel we want to give him the opportunity of using this committee as a soap box for his doctrines. I want to say emphatically we have no use for him. But I cannot see, Mr. Lavery, any difference between Red fascism or the fascism we have just defeated on the battlefields of Europe.

I think the committee had better take a few minutes' recess.

(A short recess was had at this point.)

Chairman TENNEY. Have you anything further from Mr. Lavery, Mr. Combs?

Mr. COMBS. No; that is all.

Chairman TENNEY. Mr. Lavery, we appreciate your coming down. I think there is one other series of questions we have not gone into with Mr. Lavery.

Q. What is this proposal in reference to American Authors Authority?—A. I would be glad to go into it.

Q. I would like to have a statement about that for the record.—A. The four guilds of the Authors League of America are considering the formation of a project known as the American Authors Authority. It is a simple committee of the whole to represent the four guilds of the Authors League with respect to certain practices in the marketing of original material for the screen, the radio, and for the publishing field. At the present time there are no regulations and no basic agreement which govern the sale of original material to the screen. Most of the Screen Writers Guild and most of the other guilds of the Authors League believe that the time has come to stabilize that situation. We think it can be stabilized by a licensing program, a program under which original material is licensed for stated intervals to the screen rather than sold. That is not a unique departure in the writing field. The Dramatists Guild in the theater has operated under that policy for a long time. Producers in New York literally license plays. We believe that it is time for writers of America

to license their material to the screen, to the radio, and to the book publishers.

The American Authors Authority is a plan whereby the four guilds of the league could put into operation this licensing program. It also involves the principle of separation of copyrights and the reversion of copyrights. At the present time when a man sells material to the screen the major studios usually require that they be listed as the corporate author of the property, a complete legal fiction, but they insist on it and the writers usually agree. When pictures are remade in Hollywood, as they often are, the original writers do not share in the profits of the remake, whereas in the theater a man shares in the continuing profits from his play as long as the copyright exists. We think it is a very laudable thing.

Q. Would that mean, Mr. Lavery, that the authority would copyright the production or the work in its own name?—A. There have been various proposals in that respect. In the early discussion of the plan it was proposed that individual authors should assign to the authority as trustee their copyright in order to clarify and unify the position of the authority in enforcing authors' rights. That is not a hard-and-fast principle. It is a matter of argument between counsel at the present time. It may well be in the final analysis the individual will hold onto his copyright or there might be a joint trusteeship of the individual copyright and the authority. However, it works out, the authority is simply an attorney in fact, a trustee, designed to restore to the individual writers so many of his rights which are now held by book publishers, advertising agencies, and motion-picture studios.

Q. May I ask this: Would the authority if it were set up under some plan or another because of the bargaining contract that you have with the publishers include independent writers?—A. No. That has been discussed in committees both east and west. Obviously, you can see, Senator, that if the authority was to work it would only be good to the degree that everybody was in. In other words, it isn't planned to keep anybody out. This is a plan involving the participation of all writers in all fields.

Incidentally, there is no thought of group control of content of scripts. Let me assure you that writers are a pretty hard bunch to unify from any one proposition from the time of day to the time of night. No guild to my knowledge has ever attempted and could not attempt to bring about group control of content of property. That is simply not an issue in this case. It is a trusteeship designed to restore to individual writers many of their rights which are now held by other people because it is true the writer has sold them away.

Q. Would it be along the lines of the American Society of Composers and Publishers?—A. Well, that is not as good as a parallel as it might be. It is perfectly true some columns have referred to the AAA as a writers' ASCAP. But ASCAP is a thing that fits the musicians. Ours isn't something that fits the musicians. The closest parallel is how the Dramatists Guild functions in the theater. In the Dramatists Guild they hold individual copyrights. Their material is only licensed to Broadway producers. When Broadway dramatists market their wares to the screen they sell them, but because they have been a part of a licensing program in the theater they would like a licensing program for pictures. So far as the studios are concerned they would not be hurt financially at all. They might have to pay something out on a remake when they make a remake once every 7 years, and the writer who originally conceived it would participate once more, but actually it won't hurt them very much.

Q. Who, if you know, originated this idea within your group?—A. Oh, that was on the agenda of our Screen Writers' board for a long time. I think, without taking any credit away from Jim Cain, I think I really kicked the ball off in an article in the Screen Writer called *Time for Decision*, which was an explanation of the licensing program. But we had a subcommittee which had been considering this project for some time.

Q. Would you mind telling us, if you have no objections, who were the members of the subcommittee, if you know?—A. I haven't got them here, but I can get them and send them to the committee. I think it was either seven or nine people on that subcommittee. We had been discussing it for a long time.

I might point out in passing that when the project was submitted to the Authors League council in New York recently they unanimously referred the proposal to the four guilds for study, and took the opportunity of rededicating themselves then and there to the principle that licensing of material is to be preferred to sale, and that separation of copyrights and the reversion of rights are sound principles that we shall all stand for at all times.

Now, I am perfectly well aware that people like Dorothy Thompson and Louis Bromfield have gone up and down the country saying this is a Stalinist plot. It seems to me that everything is a Stalinist plot to those two, no matter who starts it or finishes it. The truth of the matter is, this is a highly capitalistic enterprise designed to put a little more capital into the pockets of the writers. It is definitely a capitalistic enterprise, nothing else. Licensing is one of the soundest traditions in American business, as you gentlemen know. The International Business Machine Corp. never sells a machine, and we think if that is good practice for IBM it is excellent practice for writers, too.

Chairman TENNEY. I think that is all unless you gentlemen have some questions.

The WITNESS. May I just add as a footnote that I appreciate the opportunity to appear before the committee. I have enjoyed the discussion with Senator Tenney. I would like to add only one thought, that if it is desirable to study social tensions in a community it seems to me that the way to meet social tensions is to get at the roots of them. It isn't enough either in committee, public platforms, in debate, in guilds and unions to pass resolutions about the people who are responsible for this tension or that tension. I think that we have to look underneath in the life of the community and see what the causes of the tensions are. If it was true that in the Sleepy Lagoon case certain Communists agitated that case for their own point of view, then it seems to me the challenge to this committee and to me as an individual is to go even still deeper into the life of the community and to say to ourselves, "What are those conditions there that made it so easy for those people to agitate that condition? What is the root condition that needs to be corrected?"

Chairman TENNEY. Mr. Lavery, may I say this with reference to that, and point out something that happened in that case for your information. In the first place, our activity as a committee is confined to investigating subversive activities of whatsoever kind may exist; therefore, we are confined to that activity. Now, in the Sleepy Lagoon case and the zoot-suit riots, and so forth, the Communist press for months had been accusing a group known as the Sinarquists as a fifth column, a Fascist fifth column, fomenting difficulties in Los Angeles. Mrs. LaRue McCormick, Philip Connelly, and many, many people connected with Communist front organizations, and in many cases openly Communists, were making these accusations. The committee felt that because of what was being done they should do something about it. We made but we did not issue subpoenas. We sent invitations and asked them to come before the committee and give us all the information they had so that we could make an investigation of that matter. None of them came. They ignored the invitation. So the committee then issued subpoenas to all of them. We met in this room. We brought them before us and told them we were interested in their accusations and wanted some evidence. I believe the members of the committee and Mr. Combs will verify what I say; they did not offer the committee one scintilla of evidence, not a single thing. There was only one conclusion to draw from that: that they were deliberately arousing racial antagonisms for their own purposes. Now, certainly we admit there are many abuses. I admit very freely that there were many, many abuses. We have seen many cases of discrimination because of race and color.

We condemn that with all of the vehemence that we can. It is un-American. We are opposed to it. Wherever we have found it we have attempted to knock it down. We subpoenaed members of the Ku Klux Klan in this room in 1940 and 1941. We believe we broke them up. Today we are going into that matter again. If there is any evidence of these things we want it. We feel with all of its weaknesses and all of the things wrong with us this is the greatest country on the face of the globe. We don't want communism. We don't want nazism. We don't fascism. As a citizen I will be glad to go into those things that might occur to you, but as a committee we are confined to one thing. We do appreciate your coming before us.

The WITNESS. I am available for the committee at any time.

Chairman TENNEY. Thank you very much.

Mr. COMBS. May Mr. Lavery be excused?

Chairman TENNEY. You may be excused, Mr. Lavery.

The WITNESS. Thank you.

Chairman TENNEY. Mr. Robeson, Senator Dilworth will swear you.

Mr. LAVRY. And on page 283, Mr. Tenney says I am not a Communist and the guild is not Communist-controlled. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, Mr. Stripling, proceed with your questions.

Mr. LAVERY. I had one more——

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, go ahead.

Mr. LAVERY. I wanted to have a notation made for the record that in October 1946, a few weeks after I appeared before the Tenney committee, I appeared voluntarily before the office of the FBI in Los Angeles—the office of Mr. Richard B. Hood—and I asked him to make a notation on his record at that time that as president of the guild I had appeared before the FBI voluntarily and had offered to put myself and any records of our guild completely at his disposal at any time. I have not heard from him.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mr. LAVERY. That was in October 1946. I think the records of Mr. Hood in the Los Angeles office of the FBI will bear me out on that.

I would also ask the chairman to permit me to have a notation made for the record that when the committee held its hearings in Los Angeles, in the spring of last year, I was not subpoenaed then, nor were any records of my guild subpoenaed, and this is the first opportunity that I have had.

Mr. Chairman, I won't bother you with anything more about it, except it——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, just to keep the record straight——

Mr. LAVERY. Surely.

Mr. STRIPLING. The subcommittee was in Los Angeles this year.

Mr. LAVERY. Oh, I am sorry.

Now, Mr. Chairman—and this will dispense with my preliminary motions—I have a piece of information that I would like to put in the record on my own motion and on my volunteering, because I am not sure as a student of constitutional law whether the committee does have the authority to demand it of me, but let me break the suspense immediately and tell you that I am not a Communist. I never have been. I don't intend to be. I will make open confession and admit that I am a Democrat who in my youth was a Republican. And if the committee wants to know why I changed from Republican to Democrat——

The CHAIRMAN. No; we are not interested in why you changed. [Laughter.] Go ahead, Mr. Stripling, with the questions. Proceed with the questions.

Mr. LAVERY. This is the [handing statement to Mr. Stripling]——

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

(The chairman confers with Mr. Lavery.)

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, Mr. Stripling, with the questions.

Mr. LAVERY. The Chair suggested I might leave that.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I think in the interest of orderly procedure it would be much better if the witness answered the questions which the committee is going to ask him.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness has already agreed.

Mr. LAVERY. I have agreed.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right. You are now the president of the Screen Writers Guild; is that true?

Mr. LAVERY. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. How many times have you been president?

Mr. LAVERY. I am serving my third and last term.

Mr. STRIPLING. And when were you last elected?

Mr. LAVERY. A year ago this November.

Mr. STRIPLING. How many members are there of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LAVERY. I think our active voting members number approximately 937. Our nonvoting associate members number approximately 531.

Mr. STRIPLING. And what is the purpose of the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. We are the official bargaining agency for screen writers in Hollywood. We correspond roughly to the position of the Dramatists Guild in the theater and are unaffiliated with either the A. F. of L. or the CIO. Our only affiliation is with the Authors League of America.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, the Authors League of America, was that established by the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. No. The Authors League of America is a much older organization. It has been in existence for some time. It is a, you might call it, federation which unifies the Radio Writers Guild, the Authors League, the Dramatists Guild, and ourselves, although we are not full members of the league. We are merely an affiliate.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is the purpose of the American Authors Authority? What does it seek to do?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, the American Authors Authority, which is not in existence, was a licensing plan proposed by the Screen Writers Guild to get better terms for the marketing of original material sold for the screen. At the present time the Screen Writers Guild has a minimum basic agreement with producers, under which various terms of employment are stabilized. But that is definitely an employment situation. We have no contract which covers the sale of original material.

The AAA was an attempt to establish a plan of licensing under which authors would not sell outright their material for the screen, but would license it for a certain term of years, for various percentages of profit.

Mr. STRIPLING. You stated that the American Authors Authority is not now in existence. Was it originally formed?

Mr. LAVERY. No. It was a plan that was offered to the Authors League of America.

There was a great deal of discussion among the member guilds of the league, and the AAA as such was never adopted. But I think the principle of licensing, which was the core of AAA, is still very much a live issue and will be continued to be discussed in the Authors League of America and member guilds for many years to come.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Lavery, as president of the guild, have you ever noticed or observed or are you aware of any Communist infiltration within the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, I have said many times—I make it as a general assumption—that there are probably Communists in the Screen Writers Guild. I can't particularize that assumption as to individuals, but I am willing to make the assumption generally that, I think, there are Communists in the Screen Writers Guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. What influence do you think they exert within the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, Mr. Stripling, I think it is not half as much as they make out. I think that our Screen Writers Guild is not much different from most guilds, most unions in this country. It has what this committee would probably consider an extreme left and it has an extreme right, but the great rank and file of the membership is what I call liberal center. And, like any guild, we have our discussions. We try to keep them in the family. We try to solve them in the family, as long as we can. I think we keep our guild on a good, even keel.

My only concern with respect to this whole proceeding, Mr. Chairman, is merely that people might go back home and think that they have been political martyrs. An election in November which is coming up in our Screen Writers Guild might be seriously affected, and not for the better, if people thought that perhaps government had interfered any more than was necessary in the normal operations of the guild.

I think our guild has been competent in the past and is now competent to manage its own affairs, to keep it definitely in the American order of things, and to do well by the country and by its own guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you familiar with Mr. John Howard Lawson?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes. I have known John Howard Lawson for some years.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is it true that he was the first president of the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. I think way back in the early days, prior to reorganization of the guild in 1937, John Howard Lawson was president, in those very early days; yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Is he now a member of the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes; I believe Mr. Lawson is obviously still a member of the guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think that John Howard Lawson is a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, I have no information beyond what I have heard read into the record here during the few days that I have been in Washington. I don't know whether he is or not. I have never seen his card. But I have heard the testimony that has been offered here this week.

Mr. STRIPLING. Does Mr. Lawson conduct himself in guild affairs along the Communist Party line?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, the truth of the matter is, Mr. Stripling, that Mr. Lawson hasn't been as active in the affairs of the guild, at least on the floor of meetings that I have chaired, as he was in years gone by.

Mr. STRIPLING. What about Mr. Dalton Trumbo? Do you know Mr. Dalton Trumbo?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes; I know Mr. Trumbo.

Mr. STRIPLING. And Mr. Trumbo was editor of the Screen Writer, the official publication of the guild, was he not?

Mr. LAVERY. That is true. At one time Mr. Dalton Trumbo was editor of the Screen Writer, the monthly publication of the Screen Writers Guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know if he holds any other position in the Screen Writers Guild at this time?

Mr. LAVERY. I don't think so at this time.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you think Mr. Dalton Trumbo is a Communist?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, I have no information beyond what I have heard here this week. I mean, I have heard the memoranda read and the charge made that there was a membership card in his name.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you familiar with the statement which the Hollywood Reporter carried, asking Mr. Trumbo and others who are members of the Screen Writers Guild to deny that they held party card so and so?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes. But the reason that perhaps I don't attribute too much weight to what the Hollywood Reporter says, Mr. Stripling, is that one time they said the same things about me and until I threatened to sue Mr. Wilkerson for libel. He published a two-page retraction, at his own expense. He was making the same charge against me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well——

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't it quite strange, then, that they don't threaten to sue?

Mr. LAVERY. Well, maybe I like to sue more than other people, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. These days everybody likes to sue. I can tell you that.

Mr. LAVERY. I meant to make a notation in the record earlier, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the credibility of witnesses who have preceded me, that I have a libel suit pending in the State of California against one of the star witnesses of this committee. I have sued Mrs. Lela Rogers in the Superior Court of California for \$1,000,000, in libel and slander, for remarks made about a play of mine, which has been mentioned here, The Gentleman from Athens, in a Town Hall broadcast on September 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Wasn't that all in the newspapers?

Mr. LAVERY. It was also in the records of this committee, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Well——

Mr. LAVERY. Everything except the fact that I sued her for libel.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, is it pertinent to this inquiry?

Mr. LAVERY. I think it is pertinent as to the credibility of whatever Mrs. Rogers said.

Mr. STRIPLING. I don't think Mrs. Rogers made any mention of it during her testimony, Mr. Lavery.

Mr. LAVERY. No; but she talked about communism in Hollywood.

Mr. STRIPLING. But we are now asking you about communism in the Screen Writers Guild, of which there is apparently quite some activity.

Mr. LAVERY. All right, let us discuss communism in the Screen Writers Guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. I think that is the purpose for having the witness here.

Mr. LAVERY. All right.

Mr. STRIPLING. As president of the Screen Writers Guild, we would like to know just what influence the Communists exercise in the Screen Writers Guild, because the people whom we have had here the last several days and who have refused to answer whether or not they were Communists have long associations with the Communist Party.

There has been introduced documentary evidence to show that Communist membership.

Now, what influence do the six people who have been here in the last 3 days exercise in the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, I say they do not have control of the guild, and if they did have control of the guild I would have stayed home long ago.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did they ever have control of the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Not while I have been president.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Mr. Trumbo, who was the editor of the Screen Writer, the official organ of the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes; that is true, but I think——

Mr. STRIPLING. I think some of these others have held prominent positions in the guild.

Mr. LAVERY. Yes; but we are a guild of many, many members, Mr. Stripling—937 or 931 active members. You have mentioned the names of perhaps a half dozen.

Mr. STRIPLING. There will be others.

Mr. LAVERY. I will be glad to discuss them, if I can.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you think it is possible for a few Communists to exert tremendous influence within unions and organizations?

Mr. LAVERY. I think it is possible for them to try. I don't think in a group of writers it is possible for them to get away with it. Have you ever tried to organize a group of writers to do anything? [Laughter.]

(The chairman pounds gavel.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, are you familiar with an organization known as the Hollywood Writers Mobilization?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes. I was its wartime chairman. And may I point out for the record that there was an error made the other day in one of the dossiers describing the organization the Hollywood Writers Mobilization. I don't know much about the personal careers of Mr. John Howard Lawson or the political careers of Mr. Lawson and Mr. Trumbo. I know something about the Writers Mobilization. I don't know where your investigators got their information, but I am sure the FBI in Los Angeles can tell you that the Hollywood Writers Mobilization was not the successor of the League of American Writers. Nobody who knows the Hollywood scene would ever make that observation. The Hollywood Writers Mobilization was roughly what you might call a writers' war board, formed on the west coast during the war, to service the agencies of the Government in their need for various scripts in various parts of the war effort.

And I have brought with me here today, if the committee is interested, a medal [indicating]—not an important medal, but a medal anyway—which the Treasury Department of the United States sent to me as chairman of the Writers Mobilization in return for the work that I did in the war years.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, if the members have any questions at this point. I would like a few moments to review certain notes I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lavery, the committee has gone over your statement. In view of the fact that you have indicated your attitude very fully up to now—and you will probably have more to add—plus the additional fact that there is much in your statement that is not pertinent to the inquiry, we decline to have you read the statement in these hearings.

Mr. LAVERY. May I have a notation made for the record, Mr. Chairman, that I respectfully dissent?

The CHAIRMAN. That is all right. That is your right.

Mr. LAVERY. And may I carry the further notation that I am always available and at the service of the committee for any questions.

I don't want to leave this stand, Mr. Chairman, without going exhaustively into any questions—

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, we are not asking you to leave the stand.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We want you to go into the matter very thoroughly.

Mr. LAVERY. I will be glad to.

The CHAIRMAN. Very thoroughly.

Mr. LAVERY. I will be glad to.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, can you tell me what position, if any, you ever held in the Hollywood Writers Mobilization?

Mr. LAVERY. I was its wartime chairman.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether the Writers Mobilization ever attempted any censorship?

Mr. LAVERY. I don't see how they would be in a position to, Mr. Stripling. They wrote literally on assignment to Government agencies. The production of—

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you describe for the committee just what the Writers Mobilization did do—its entire functions?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes. As a matter of fact, some of it is here in my record. I have the full report, which was once put in the Congressional Record. But, briefly, it was a clearing house set up by six or seven guilds in Hollywood, to pool their common functions as writers, actors, directors, and producers, in the preparation of scripts for War bond drives; documentaries for use of the Army or Navy or Treasury Departments; and similar activity—the preparation of speeches during the war drive. But this was definitely what you might call a cooperative research agency placed at the disposal of the Government.

The speeches or films or scripts were never produced by us. They were written by us and then turned over to the people who had ordered them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, in connection with your activities with the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, did they ever take a position regarding the production of Abie's Irish Rose?

Mr. LAVERY. I can't recall, Mr. Stripling. Now, perhaps at some time. I retired from the mobilization in late 1945, when I was cast to work on *The Magnificent Yankee*. Offhand, I don't recall action regarding Abie's Irish Rose.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce into the record a letter from Bing Crosby dated March 11, 1947, addressed to Mr. Howard Koch, chairman of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization.

Mr. LAVERY. May I point out, then, if you are reading when Mr. Koch was chairman, that was when I was no longer active in the mobilization and I have no knowledge——

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you a member of the mobilization?

Mr. LAVERY. Not after that time. I was not identified with the mobilization after Mr. Koch became chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of this letter?

Mr. STRIPLING. March 11, 1947.

The CHAIRMAN. March 11, 1947.

Mr. LAVERY. May I point out that by that time I had resigned from the mobilization?

Mr. STRIPLING. Why did you resign, Mr. Lavery?

Mr. LAVERY. Increase of other work. I was president of the Screen Writers Guild at the same time. I had just come back from New York, where I had been at work on my own play. There was too much to do. So I simply carried on with the guild and resigned from the mobilization.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, even though it hasn't anything to do with this witness, is the letter pertinent to the inquiry?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. I think it deals with the objections on the part of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization to the production of Abie's Irish Rose. Mr. Bing Crosby wrote a letter concerning it.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, go ahead and read it.

Mr. STRIPLING. It is addressed to Mr. Koch, chairman of the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, 1655 North Cherokee, Hollywood 28, Calif.

DEAR MR. KOCH: I feel the production Abie's Irish Rose is a victim of a very unfortunate turn of events. When I was approached to lend my name to a group concerned with the production of this picture—and that is all I ever did—lend my name—I consented on the representation, entirely credible, that such a film would prove an effective means of advancing interracial amity.

The film was made with complete script and dialog approval of all sects and with proper representatives of such groups in attendance on the set.

It is inconceivable to me now that any group can, in conscience, object to the film or any part thereof. But a concerted campaign is being waged against the booking of the picture, in the motion-picture business, and against its exhibition to the public.

In the most liberal interpretation possible, such action can only be construed as unfair, unjust, and restraint of trade.

Sincerely yours,

BING CROSBY.

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to comment on it, though I was not a member of the mobilization at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that you are on the witness stand, you can comment.

Mr. LAVERY. I think there are lots of people in America who might make a comment on Abie's Irish Rose without being a Communist. There are matters of taste in the theater. There are many people, both Catholic and Jew, who work in the theater who don't like the oversimplification of those types. I can conceive of lots of people protesting the production of Abie's Irish Rose as merely perpetuating stage types that have gone out of fashion and that don't do justice to the racial groups concerned. I don't think one has to be a Communist to take exception to Abie's Irish Rose.

Mr. McDOWELL. On the other hand, Mr. Lavery, one wouldn't be some sort of a Fascist to have enjoyed Abie's Irish Rose.

Mr. LAVERY. I agree absolutely, Mr. McDowell, absolutely.

Mr. McDOWELL. If I recall, I saw it four or five times, and millions of Americans did and thought it was a delightful story and well played.

Mr. LAVERY. I agree with you. I think that one could have a difference of opinion over the merits of Abie's Irish Rose without either being a Fascist on the one side, or a Communist on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. If you people don't stop pretty soon, I'll be reading the book.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, in regard to the presence within the Screen Writers Guild of Communists, do you think that any action should be taken to remove these people from the guild, or do you think it is all right for them to remain in the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, I stand with Mr. Edgar Hoover, of the FBI. Mr. Hoover says he thinks it would be bad policy to outlaw the Communist Party and to drive it underground. I think so, too. I think that under our existing contract with the producers and our existing constitution, it would be next to impossible for us to remove anybody from our guild for political belief, private political belief or action.

In our guild, I have said many times that if any individual members are guilty of indictable offenses, that are clearly sedition or treason, let a proper complaint be brought to the FBI and an indictment sought by a Federal grand jury and action taken accordingly. But short of that, particularly in time of peace, it would be disastrous for a guild to attempt to project a standard of conduct not yet embodied in the law by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your opinion as to the Communist Party of the United States? Do you think they are a political party, or do you consider them to be the agent of a foreign principal?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, like many Americans, I am confused. I don't know. I don't know. I will say quite frankly, that, as an American, I like my country. I don't think I would like a party that was devoted to a foreign power or that was an agent of a foreign power. I think the basic difficulty is that it is a demonstrable point in each individual case. If a man is an unregistered agent of a foreign power, then I think he ought to be indicted and tried for any offense that is appropriate under the Federal law. But to make the general observation, I don't know. Perhaps it is. I haven't the access to the information.

Mr. STRIPLING. For example——

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute, Mr. Stripling.

A short time ago you mentioned J. Edgar Hoover, that you agreed with J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. LAVERY. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever heard that J. Edgar Hoover testified before this committee that Communists were agents of a foreign power?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes; I think I have heard something to that effect, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, then, in view of that, won't you, too, agree with J. Edgar Hoover that Communists were agents of a foreign power?

Mr. LAVERY. I would still say, Mr. Chairman, that it was a case of proof and fact in each individual case. We toss the word "communism" around. I have heard nobody on this stand or in the committee either define the kind of communism we are talking about. I assume it is Marxian communism. But there are shades and shades of people in this country who consider themselves Communists, and there are shades and shades of people who are called Communists without being it. So when counsel asks me to generalize, do I think the Communists are agents of a foreign power, I will say, "Well, how can anybody under oath answer with any assurance." I don't know. I don't have the facts.

Mr. STRIPLING. We will limit it to Stalinists. Do you think the Stalinist Communists are the agents of a foreign power?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, I have no way of knowing who is or who is not a Stalinist. If I was a member of the FBI or if I were a member of the research staff of this committee, perhaps I would have such information. I don't. And as a matter of fact, under the constitution of the guild of which I am president, I am discouraged from inquiring into the political or religious belief of our members, and I think wisely. We would have no guild if the president could begin to examine each member on his political or religious beliefs.

The CHAIRMAN. Nothing has been brought up about religion, Mr. Lavery, except by yourself.

Mr. LAVERY. No. Mr. Rupert Hughes brought up religion. He said that I was a Communist masquerading as a Catholic.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I want to tell you something. I didn't hear Rupert Hughes say that, but I want to tell you this, that this committee is never interested in one's religion.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, what is your opinion about outlawing the Communist Party?

Mr. LAVERY. I think Mr. Hoover is right on that. I think it would be disastrous to drive them underground. I think the best answer to communism is to live a better life, run a better guild. I think if we make political martyrs out of them we make it easy for the Communists. I think Mr. Hoover is absolutely right. Certainly in time of peace, if we are not on the verge of war, I think it would be fatal to outlaw any one political party.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, for example, we take Mr. Albert Maltz. Are you familiar with Mr. Maltz?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes; I know Mr. Maltz.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you remember that Mr. Maltz wrote an article which appeared in the New Masses, official organ of the Communist Party?

Mr. LAVERY. I heard reference made to it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. Are you familiar with the letter which he wrote and the article which he subsequently wrote in which he did a complete somersault?

Mr. LAVERY. No; I am not. I am familiar with that book—Cross and the Sword, was it; Cross and the Arrow—that was mentioned, but I am not familiar with the author, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, would you say that a person in the Screen Writers Guild who consistently, without any deviation, followed the

exact line as laid down by the Soviet Union and who has followed the Communist Party throughout the world, would you say that person is following the Communist Party line of Stalinism, or do you think that he is exercising his freedom of political belief?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, I just don't know. I mean, this is a——

Mr. STRIPLING. There are a number of these people, Mr. Lavery, in your guild; a number of them, very prominent.

Mr. LAVERY. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, you have been president three times. You certainly must have observed their activities, and I think you are a little more aware than you have told the committee of just how they operate.

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Stripling, if you want me to make myself counsel for the prosecution, that is rather difficult. That is your job. I am not here either as prosecutor or as defendant. I'll admit I have had arguments with a lot of these people in the guild, arguments about a lot of things, but I am not here crying as an alarmist. I say we have a good guild. I say it is on an even keel. I say that some of the people who have appeared before you with tales about our guild are sincere, but I think they are mistaken. They are more alarmed than I am. I don't know why you rate so highly the influence of Mr. Maltz, Mr. Lawson, Mr. Trumbo. They are able men. They are articulate men. And they are competent screen writers. But they are only a few of a membership of 900 some. We have often had our arguments within the family, often. I think so far I have had the upper hand. Since I have the upper hand, I have nothing to complain about. And when Mr. Stripling says, "Aren't you worried about Mr. Maltz," I say, "not particularly." If I were, I wouldn't continue as president of our guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, during this year, in the spring of this year, did Mr. Eric Johnston come to Hollywood and appear before a meeting of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, indeed; as the result of a series of invitations from me. I had been urging Mr. Johnston to come over and speak to our guild for a year.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long did that meeting last?

Mr. LAVERY. Oh, perhaps an hour and a half, maybe 2 hours.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Mr. Johnston urge the guild to oust the Communists within it?

Mr. LAVERY. Oh, I think that is a very broad interpretation of what Mr. Johnston said. I think——

Mr. STRIPLING. I just asked you. Did he?

Mr. LAVERY. No; I wouldn't say that that was the effect of it. I don't think Mr. Johnston would attempt to come to the guild and tell them what to do.

Mr. STRIPLING. You tell the committee what happened. We subpoenaed Mr. Johnston and his minutes.

Mr. LAVERY. I would be glad to give to the committee my recollection of Mr. Johnston's talk that night, although I suggest, as a lawyer, that the best evidence is Mr. Johnston's own copy of the speech, which I am sure he would be glad to give to the committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I was in error. We did not subpoena the minutes of the meeting. However, Mr. Johnston did tell me of that meeting.

Mr. LAVERY. Yes, he spoke. We had a lot of questions and answers. He gave us a picture of the international situation. He certainly indicated his forthright disapproval of communism, at all levels. He did give what he thought was the high ideal, with relation to writing for the screen, to the kind of stories at this time that might attract the interest of writers. But I can't honestly say that I recall Mr. Johnston telling the guild to get rid of any group of members. As a matter of fact, it was a very peaceful meeting. If Mr. Johnston made that kind of a speech, we probably would have been there until 2 o'clock that morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Why would that be, if he made that kind of a speech?

Mr. LAVERY. Why, Mr. Chairman, because writers are articulate people. They will argue at the drop of a hat. It doesn't matter what the argument is about. And if somebody tells them they can't do something, particularly if he be a producer or a representative of a producer, we will stay there all night with him, just perhaps to be negative. That is why I recall quite distinctly that I don't think Mr. Johnston made that broad sweeping demand, because we would have had a long, long evening of it, believe me.

Mr. STRIPLING. It wasn't a very heated meeting, in other words?

Mr. LAVERY. I don't think so. I thought it was a very friendly meeting, and on our part we hoped it would be the first of several, that Mr. Johnston and his associates would come back from time to time and discuss with us our common problems in picture making.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was his appearance there regarding the problem of picture making, or was it regarding the issue of communism within the guild?

Mr. LAVERY. Oh, no. Ever since Mr. Johnston had become president of the Motion Picture Association I had been urging him to come and speak to the writers, and I think Mr. Johnston was anxious to come and speak to us. As you can imagine, in an industry as diversified as ours, relations between producers, employers, and writers, particularly at the creative level, are often, shall we say, competitive. There is not always the clearest understanding and sympathy between the man who is paying for the script and the man who is writing it. Both Mr. Johnston and myself thought, and many other people did, it was a good opportunity for closer understanding between management, production management, on the one hand, and writers on the other. We hoped that it would be the first of several meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Stripling, may I interrupt for a moment?

Mr. LAVERY. Surely.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Witness, aren't you aware of the development of communism all over the world?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes. I read the headlines every day, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. VAIL. And isn't it your feeling, too, that communism has gained a foothold in this country, and its influence is spreading rapidly?

Mr. LAVERY. I don't think it is spreading as rapidly in this country as it is elsewhere in the world.

Mr. VAIL. But it is spreading rapidly today?

Mr. LAVERY. Elsewhere.

Mr. VAIL. That is the general consensus. In the Gallup poll not long ago the American people indicated, by their ballot, that only 1 percent felt that communism was a serious threat to this country. Now, don't you believe that the American people should be alerted to the danger that exists in the form of communism today?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Congressman, I think that they are alert to the general danger abroad of communism, but I think that the alerting at home requires a different approach, if we are really to meet the menace and be equal to it. I think in our own domestic American life the way to meet the challenge of communism is not repressive legislation or scareheads, but to show that we have a better way of life, to dramatize that life.

I feel that on the screen, for instance—now, this committee has asked previous witnesses as to whether they think anti-Communist pictures should be made. Mr. Chairman, I think that there is nothing that sends an audience out of a theater quicker than an antipicture about anything, special propaganda in any form. But I do believe, with all my heart and soul, that this is a great time for all of us to dramatize the American way of life, in any medium, at any level of life that is available for us. The more attractive we make our American scheme of life, I think the more secure we are.

Mr. VAIL. Don't you think that the gentlemen who appeared before this committee have dramatized communism to some degree by the exhibition they put on? Don't you think today that it is vital and that the American citizen be as militant and American as these Communists are militant throughout the world?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Congressman, I think there is a better way to do it. I think that if we are to keep harping on the note of fear, it is like the old-fashioned revival or the old-fashioned mission, where you scare the devil out of the parishioners for a week, and after that they are rather accustomed to the notion of fear.

I think these are times when we have to do other things that we hold dear. I don't think it is enough to make people afraid. It is very easy to make them afraid. I think the problem of all citizens and this Congress is how to make people aware of the active love that they have. I think that the negative force of fear is distinctly negative, distinctly noncreative. I think the challenge of the theater and the screen is to project an American way of life, particularly an historical drama, that vitalizes the whole tradition of which we are a part.

Believe me, I am much more interested, as a playwright and a screen writer, in trying to show, for instance, on the screen which Mr. Justice Holmes would be like than showing how bad Mr. Stalin is. It would be very easy to show how bad Mr. Stalin is. But I think that the positive virtues of our great American leaders are the thing that the screen should be showing at this time.

Mr. VAIL. Well, I think that it is the general opinion today that anyone who seeks to temper the public acceptance of the menace of communism is doing a distinct disservice to their country.

Mr. LAVERY. Well, Mr. Congressman, may I just take one exception to that, particularly in the international field, if you like. There were three editorials in the *Observatori Romano* last spring, front page,

from the Vatican, on the international situation. The Pope himself, speaking through the editorial in the *Observatori Romano*, reminded people that perhaps the time had come to slow down the push toward war.

Now, I don't think anybody calls the Holy Father a warmonger for trying to slow down the feeling of national pride and security. I think he is a man that is trying to put out fires. And I think that if sincere people come before this committee and say that they think the positive picture of the American life is the better way to do it, that doesn't mean they are less loyal Americans. I think it means they are more vital Americans, and they are trying to do it on a deeper and more stable basis than merely a lot of negativistic attacks perhaps on a potential common enemy.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell, do you have any questions?

Mr. McDOWELL. Yes.

Mr. Lavery, it is a great relief to have you testify, to hear you testify.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. McDOWELL. Without waving your arms and screaming and insisting that something was being done to you—about the Bill of Rights. It is good to hear somebody from the Screen Writers' Guild talk as freely as you have. Some of the things that you say I agree with and some I disagree with.

If your job, of course, as the president of the Screen Writers' Guild is to look after the interests of that guild and its membership, and I presume so long as you are the president of it you are going to decry any pointing out that may be Communist influence in the guild. That would be the normal thing that a president should do.

Mr. LAVERY. I simply want to appraise it, Mr. Congressman, at its true level. I won't deny that there are Communists there and that they probably would love to control it. I just say that we shouldn't rate their efforts too highly. That increases their own sense of prestige. It makes it much too easy for them.

Mr. McDOWELL. That is what I would think would be the proper attitude for the president of the guild to take. However, that still does get away from the fact that there are there, we think, some very serious enemies of the United States.

I think you are a good example of, shall I say, a liberal coming before this committee. We have been many times accused of trying to do something to liberals. We are not. Liberals are a part of America, just the same as I am, and I am not a liberal.

You sort of pooch-pooched the idea that a small minority of Communists can do much, can have much influence. Well, now, the facts don't bear out that thought. There is a very tiny minority of Communists that run 200,000,000 people in Russia, which has become a slave state. If known to every Pole——

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Congressman——

Mr. McDOWELL. To every Pole in the world——

Mr. LAVERY. I would agree to that.

Mr. McDOWELL. There are very few Poles that are Commies, compared to the number of Poles that are not, and yet Poland is a Communist state.

Mr. LAVERY. I merely say we have beaten them, whatever their size and number may be. They have not run away with the opera house.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, the fact remains here that the Congress of the United States is cognizant of the fact that subversive influence, Communist or Fascist, is at work here in the United States. And they have given us the job of finding out where they are and what they are doing, and we are trying to do that.

Mr. LAVERY. I appreciate that.

Mr. McDOWELL. There is no effort, has been no effort, nor will there ever be an effort on the part of the Congress to direct or influence, even, the motion-picture industry or any other American industry.

I think you have been a very fine witness.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Congressman.

The CHAIRMAN. At this point, the Chair would like to ask Mr. Kenny how many witnesses he has left now?

Mr. KENNY. Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, you have subpoenaed tomorrow, of the gentlemen that I represent, a man named Bert Brecht, you have subpoenaed for today Mr. Adrian Scott and Mr. Edward Dmytryk—the producer and director, respectively, of the picture Crossfire. On Friday you have subpoenaed, I think it is Mr. Cole, Mr. Salt, and one other gentleman. Those are the only ones that have been given a definite date to appear.

The CHAIRMAN. Now these two who have been subpoenaed for Friday—

Mr. KENNY. Three. There is one named—

The CHAIRMAN. Are they in town now?

Mr. KENNY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. They can go on ahead of time if we want to put them on?

Mr. KENNY. That is right. I would like a little time because—

The CHAIRMAN. You better advise all of your witnesses to stand ready and to be near, because we are going to put them on from now on quite rapidly.

Mr. KENNY. Yes.

I would like—for instance, I had today in attendance during this hearing this morning, and at noon I will have an opportunity to consult with Mr. Lardner—

The CHAIRMAN. Have those that have been subpoenaed for Friday ready to go on tomorrow.

Mr. KENNY. That is very good.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lavery, would you repeat again when you resigned from the Writers Mobilization?

Mr. LAVERY. I think it was early in 1946.

Mr. STRIPLING. Early 1946?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know a Mr. Mitchell Lindeman?

Mr. LAVERY. I believe he came into the office of the Mobilization after I had resigned. I know the name. I don't know him personally.

Mr. STRIPLING. You don't know him personally?

Mr. LAVERY. No.

Mr. STRIPLING. While you were associated with the Hollywood—

The CHAIRMAN. Speak louder, please.

Mr. STRIPLING. While you were associated with the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, did the Mobilization ever endeavor to obtain

information on the Committee on Un-American Activities, with the idea of having it abolished?

Mr. LAVERY. I don't recall that, Mr. Stripling, but I do recall at one time I was with the Mobilization I think there was some discussion as to whether Senator Jack Tenney of the California committee deserved serious study and analysis by people who had been attacked without a hearing. I remember discussions with relation to the California committee. I don't happen to recall any with relation to this committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I have here a photostatic copy of a letter written on the letterhead of New Masses, one of the official publications of the Communist Party, 104 East Ninth Street, New York 3, N. Y., dated January 17, addressed to Mr. Mitchell Lindeman, the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, 1655 North Cherokee, Hollywood 28, Calif.

DEAR MR. LINDEMAN: I am very much interested in helping expose the Un-American Activities Committee, and I do have some material in my files but I cannot send out the clippings, and so on, as I may need them at any time.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, this letter is from Virginia Gardner, who was the Washington correspondent of the New Masses.

I am going to New York this next week, however, and will ask the magazine circulation department to send you copies of New Masses in which articles on the committee appeared last year. There were three or four. I may find extra copies of Challenge, for which I also write, in which columns on the committee appeared. If not, I will ask them to supply you with them.

For instance, this Challenge "500 Fraternal Building, 1405 Glen Arm Place, Denver 2, Colo."

I would have written in reply sooner but your letter was only forwarded to me from the Daily Worker office in the National Press Building some weeks after it was sent. Note my address above.

Incidentally, your letter finally arrived at this office open, with any literature it may have contained missing. I would still like to see what you sent, so will you send a brochure again? If you would like something on the committee after it is reorganized under Thomas, please let me know and also whether you can pay for it. I got some woman to do some research work on Rankin for you a couple of years ago and it took me about 6 months to collect the money for her pay.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA GARDNER.

Mr. LAVERY. May I ask the date on that, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. I put the date in, Mr. Lavery.

Mr. LAVERY. I see.

Mr. STRIPLING. January 17, 1947.

Mr. LAVERY. Well, that was long after I had left the Mobilization.

Mr. STRIPLING. The committee, Mr. Chairman, has had quite a bit to say, however, in its memorandum on the Hollywood Writers Mobilization.

Mr. Lavery stated that he is no longer with this organization.

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to suggest to both the investigator and the witness that we hurry along, because we must finish with this testimony before noon.

Mr. LAVERY. I have just a few small points that I would like to make.

Mr. STRIPLING. Go ahead, Mr. Lavery.

Mr. LAVERY. I won't take too much time.

Just replying specifically, Mr. Chairman, to a point made last week by the previous witness, I think it was Mr. Jack Moffitt who said that I had written a play which attempted to slur the Congress of the United States. I simply want to assure this committee that I have the greatest respect for the Congress of the United States. And in some small testament of that section I tried to become a member of it. I tried to run for Congress last spring. The voters of my district, perhaps wisely, decided in the primary election that I wasn't the man to come to Congress. But I offer that one doesn't run for a thing that he doesn't value. I have the greatest respect for the Congress of the United States.

And I assure you that this play that we are working on, *The Gentleman From Athens*, will be a tribute to the democratic process. It is not designed to tear down any figure in America.

Mr. McDOWELL. What is the name of it?

Mr. LAVERY. *The Gentleman from Athens*. And when we open, Mr. Chairman, I would be delighted to have this committee and any Members of Congress to come and see it. I thought if I can't go to Congress, at least I will try to write about it in terms that will be acceptable to people who hold this thing dear.

Mr. McDOWELL. Well, not that the committee will have anything to do with the play, but *The Gentleman from Athens* is a play about the United States Congress?

Mr. LAVERY. Yes. It is a mythical town called Athens, Calif.

Mr. McDOWELL. Oh.

Mr. LAVERY. I would also like to point out that in the nature of picture making, Mr. Chairman, it so happens that our guild does not qualify the writers who are members of it. I think people might get the idea that perhaps we just go out any week that we are short of members and recruit a few more and that if the membership committee were not extraordinarily alert we might get a lot of Stalinists in. Oddly enough, our guild accepts members only after they are qualified in the industry. If a man works 26 weeks in pictures or comes to us on transfer from the Authors' League, he is an active member of our guild, but he cannot be a voting or an active member of our guild unless he works 26 weeks in the picture industry or comes to us on transfer from the Authors' League.

Another point: I feel that very few people here have had the opportunity to discuss the making of pictures. When people talk about the contents of what gets on the screen, I wonder if any witness has told this committee that it is not like the writing of a novel or the making of a play, which is often a rather individual and sole effort. It has often been said in Hollywood that the making of pictures is a kind of collaborative compromise in which the world and his brothers are in it. Fifty or more departments are involved in the preparation of the script, from the time that it is bought to the time it goes on the screen. Everybody and his brother has a hand in that script—"Put it in for Harry," "Take it out for Joe"—the advertising department, the location department—

The CHAIRMAN. I think that the committee is familiar with that.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you will understand that, why I am happy as a writer.

The CHAIRMAN. I think we understand that.

Mr. LAVERY. One more point I would like to leave with the committee, which is in my prepared statement, and I urge again if I can't read it at least the committee accept it into the record.

I feel at this time the Congress of the United States and this committee could do a great thing to raise the sights of picture making. If somebody would go to Congress and ask for enough money to permit the Library of Congress to organize an international film festival in which the best films——

The CHAIRMAN. Organize a what?

Mr. LAVERY. An international film festival in which the best work in the films of each country is presented at a festival, better than any that have been held.

Now, there are many international films festivals, but not one that we give. And sometimes the rivalries are international and rather bitter. A lot of prize competition. It seems to me that the Congress of the United States and the Library of Congress could do a great thing for picture making the world over, for better understanding between nations, if they would say: "Let us hold in Washington a great international film festival, with the best work of each country brought here and shown in the Library of Congress."

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question right here?

Mr. LAVERY. Surely, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have in mind inviting all of the nations of the world to that festival?

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Chairman, I will leave that to Congress and the Library of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the reason I asked that question was that I was wondering if we invited Russia, whether they would attend.

Mr. LAVERY. Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody can read the mind of the Russians these days, but I do think——

The CHAIRMAN. You think they would?

Mr. LAVERY. Your guess is as good as mine. Perhaps they would. But I was not thinking only of the Russians, Mr. Chairman. I was thinking that pictures, after all, are one of the great mediums of international communication. It is probably the only way the French people know what Americans as a whole are like—we know what the French people are like. Most of our people never meet—the French, the British, and even the Germans, the Austrians, and the Hungarians. Here is this great medium of communication which could do so much for better understanding between nations, which needs a little encouragement.

I think it would be a graceful thing if the Library of Congress and the Congress of the United States would say: "Why don't we have a festival, without prizes, where the best work of each nation is presented, so that we can understand really what the creative force of pictures in the world is today."

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have anything more now, to answer?

Mr. LAVERY. No. That concludes my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any more questions, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. I have no more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. LAVERY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We will recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.
(Thereupon, at 12:15 p. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Mr. STRIPLING, the first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Ring Lardner, please.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lardner.

Mr. CRUM. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Lardner will not be able to be here this afternoon. We will produce him tomorrow morning, sir. We have here Mr. Adrian Scott and Edward Dmytryk.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you mind coming up here?

Mr. CRUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When was Mr. Lardner subpoenaed?

Mr. STRIPLING. The subpoena, Mr. Chairman, called for his appearance on the 23d of October. However, the committee wired him that they would notify him of the exact date. He has not been advised of the exact date. However, since he has been in attendance here day after day——

Mr. CRUM. No; he hasn't been in attendance every day.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right; he hasn't been in attendance every day.

Mr. CRUM. We will produce him tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. All right; tomorrow morning.

Who is the next witness?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Edward Dmytryk.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dmytryk, raise your right hand, please. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF EDWARD DMYTRYK, ACCOMPANIED BY MR. KENNY AND MR. CRUM

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Dmytryk, will you state your full name and present address, please.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Edward Dmytryk; my address is 9361 Olympic Boulevard, Beverley Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was born on September 4, 1908, in Grand Forks, British Columbia, Canada.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and how did you become a citizen of the United States?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was nationalized in 1939 in Los Angeles.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I am a motion-picture director.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been acting in that occupation?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, I have been a director since 1939. However, I first entered motion pictures early in 1923.

Mr. STRIPLING. With what studios are you now associated?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I am with R. K. O.

Mr. STRIPLING. What studios were you associated with in the past?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I have worked at Universal. Most of my years were spent at Paramount.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you give the committee the names of some of the pictures you have directed?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement here that I would like to make. The names of some of the pictures I have directed are included in here. May I please make this statement?

Mr. CRUM. Show it to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me see the statement. [After a pause.] This statement is typical of the other statements that we have inspected. It is not at all pertinent to this inquiry. Therefore, the Chair rules it cannot be read.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, will you let the record show the membership of the committee, please?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

This committee is just in recess over this morning's hearing. Therefore, it is not necessary to show the membership present at this time.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Dmytryk, you are here in response to a subpoena served upon you on September 19; is that true? ⁷⁰

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes; I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. And also in response to a telegram which the chairman sent you on October 11; is that correct? ⁷¹

Mr. DMYTRYK. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that since this statement concerns the questions which have been brought up here as to the effect of this investigation—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled that the statement was not pertinent at all. The chief investigator will ask questions, and you will please answer them.

Mr. DMYTRYK. All right.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Dmytryk, are you a member of the Screen Directors Guild?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Mr. Stripling, I feel that these kinds of questions are designed to—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. It is not up to you to "feel" what the design is. It is up to you to answer the questions and be responsive to the questions.

Go ahead.

Mr. DMYTRYK. Mr. Chairman, if you will let me I will answer the question. However, most other witnesses, certainly the witnesses the first week, were given the right to answer as they pleased. Some went on at great length—

Mr. STRIPLING. Pardon me, Mr. Dmytryk. About how long a time would you require to answer whether or not you were a member of the Screen Directors Guild? Would 5 minutes be long enough?

Mr. DMYTRYK. It would take me a lot less than 5 minutes.

⁷⁰ See appendix, p. 547, for exhibit 84.

⁷¹ See appendix, p. 547, for exhibit 85.

The CHAIRMAN. It would take you 5 minutes to answer whether you are a member of the Screen Directors Guild?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I said it would take me a lot less than 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A lot less than 5 minutes. Can't you answer "yes" or "no," are you a member of the Screen Directors Guild?

Mr. DMYTRYK. There aren't many questions that can be answered "yes" or "no"—

The CHAIRMAN. I am referring to this one question. Can you answer it "yes" or "no?"

Mr. DMYTRYK. I would like to answer the question. I would like to answer it in my own way.

The CHAIRMAN. We want you to answer the question, but we want a specific answer. That question can be answered "yes" or "no."

Mr. DMYTRYK. I don't feel you should tell me how to answer the question. I have told you that I would like to answer the question in my own way.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you try to answer the question to the best of your ability, but you must make it very plain whether you are a member or not a member of the Screen Directors Guild.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I will be glad to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. If it takes a long time to answer it, why, something is wrong.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I don't think it will take long enough to bore you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I think that this kind of questioning is designed to bring about a split in many of the guilds among the members of the guilds at a time when we have just succeeded in getting unity between the guilds.

I do want to say, however, that it is a matter of public record, since a fight some of us had against Mr. Wood—Sam Wood—in which Mr. Wood wound up on the losing end, with the entire guild against Sam Wood, that I was an officer of the Screen Directors Guild.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party, Mr. Dmytryk?

Mr. DMYTRYK. Well, Mr. Stripling, I think that there is a question of constitutional rights involved here. I don't believe that you have—

The CHAIRMAN. When did you learn about the Constitution? Tell me when you learned about the Constitution.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I will be glad to answer that question, Mr. Chairman. I first learned about the Constitution in high school and again—

Mr. McDOWELL. Let's have the answer to the other question.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I was asked when I learned about the Constitution.

Mr. STRIPLING. I believe the first question, Mr. Dmytryk, was: Are you now, or have you ever been, a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. DMYTRYK. All right, gentlemen; if you will keep your questions simple, and one at a time, I will be glad to answer.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is very simple.

Mr. DMYTRYK. The chairman asked me another question.

The CHAIRMAN. Never mind my question. I will withdraw the question.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I have been advised that there is a question of constitutional rights involved. The Constitution does not ask that such a question be answered in the way that Mr. Stripling wants it answered. I think that what organizations I belong to, what I think, and what I say cannot be questioned by this committee.

Mr. STRIPLING. Then you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. DMYTRYK. I do not refuse to answer it. I answered it in my own way.

Mr. STRIPLING. You haven't answered whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. DMYTRYK. I answered by saying I do not think you have the right to ask—

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that the witness is pursuing the same line as the other witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness is excused.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like to put Mr. Russell on the stand.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, you have previously been sworn and identified before the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you instructed to make an investigation to determine whether or not Edward Dmytryk was ever at any time a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give the committee the result of your investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Edward Dmytryk joined the Communist Party of Los Angeles approximately in the spring of 1944 and was recruited by Herbert Biberman. It should be noted that Herbert Biberman is reported to have been a member of the party for approximately 18 years. Edward Dmytryk was issued Communist Party book No. 84961, for the year 1944, and when the party was reportedly dissolved in the summer of 1944 and the Communist Political Association organized in its stead, he was issued 1944 Communist Political Association membership card No. 46859, and for 1945 the Communist Political Association membership card No. 47238.

In the fall of 1945, when the Communist Political Association was dissolved, and the Communist Party of the United States of America reinstated, registration card No. 35393 was executed for Edward Dmytryk.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

You don't have any additional information on this man?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; there is some.

Mr. STRIPLING. Go right ahead. Sorry.

Mr. RUSSELL. During this membership Dmytryk was first a member of a club within the northwest section of Los Angeles County Communist Party of writers and directors. In 1945 he was placed in a cultural group which was referred to first as a special group for nine of the most prominent Communists in the motion-picture industry and later referred to as the Davis Club, in honor of the Communist councilman in New York City, Ben Davis.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the committee has a memorandum here concerning Edward Dmytryk [reading]:

Edward Dmytryk has been associated with the motion-picture industry as a producer and a director. According to the International Motion Picture Almanac, and other sources, he produced *The White Tower*, RKO, 1947, and was the director of the following films: *Television Spy*, Paramount, 1939; *Zaza*, Paramount, 1939; *Some Like It Hot*, Paramount, 1939; *Emergency Squad*, Paramount, 1940; *Mystery Sea Raider*, Paramount, 1940—

There are quite a number, Mr. Chairman. Is it all right to suspend the reading, or do you want them all read? The pictures which he has directed?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; without objection, so ordered.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

Golden Gloves, Paramount, 1940; *Her First Romance*, Monogram, 1940; *The Devil Commands*, Columbia, 1941; *Under Age*, Columbia, 1941; *Sweethearts of the Campus*, Columbia, 1941; *The Blonde from Singapore*, Columbia, 1941; *Secrets of the Lone Wolf*, Columbia, 1941; *Confession of Boston Blackie*, Columbia, 1941; *Counter Espionage*, Columbia, 1942; *Seven Miles from Alcatraz*, RKO, 1942; *The Falcon Strikes Back*, RKO, 1943; *Hitler's Children*, RKO, 1943; *Farewell, My Lovely*, RKO, 1944; *Behind the Rising Sun*, RKO, 1943; *Murder, My Sweet*, RKO, 1944; *The Invisible Army*, Back to Bataan, RKO; and *Cornered*.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

1. The American Youth for Democracy was formerly known as the Young Communist League. On April 17, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities issued a report on the American Youth for Democracy in which it called upon the governors or legislatures of the various States and the administrative heads of the colleges and universities "to thoroughly expose the Communist connections of the American Youth for Democracy as well as the inimical objectives of the Communist Party in America." The Congressional Record of March 24, 1947, page A-1298, contains a statement made by the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in which he spoke of the American Youth for Democracy as the organization "which conceals the evils and the corruption of American communism. This name is but a new one for the former Young Communist League. It reflects all the sinister purposes of the Communist Party of the United States. It employs the same techniques and has the same objectives, namely, the conversion of our haven of liberty and freedom to worship as we choose to a godless, totalitarian state where the adversaries of democracy can do as they please." The American Youth for Democracy was also cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944. *People's World* of December 1, 1944, lists Edward Dmytryk as a sponsor of the American Youth for Democracy. *People's World* is the west-coast organ of the Communist Party.

2. The People's Educational Center came into existence in the fall of 1943 with a \$1,000 loan from the writers' school which was held under the auspices of the League of American Writers. It acquired a rather complete library from the Communist Los Angeles Workers School—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, how long is this?

Mr. STRIPLING. There are only six points, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading) :

An article from People's World of February 6, 1945, page 3, column 3, announced the dissolution of the Los Angeles Workers School and stated that it had participated in the founding and the development of the People's Educational Center. The records of the Committee on Un-American Activities reveal that many members of the faculty and staff of the People's Educational Center, such as Carl Winters, Eva Shafraan, Mildred Raskin, Bruce Minton, Ruth McKenney, Dorothy Healy, John Howard Lawson, were card-holding members of the Communist Party. Variety of June 30, 1947, page 10, and the school catalog for the winter of 1947, page 14, list Edward Dmytryk as an instructor for the People's Educational Center.

3. The League of American Writers, an affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow, was pledged to the defense of the Soviet Union and the "use of art as an instrument of the class struggle." On three occasions it has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as shown by the reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944. It was also cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle, who said in his characterization of the organization: "The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, p. 7686). According to People's World of February 11, 1943, page 5, Edward Dmytryk was affiliated with the League of American Writers School as a teacher-director.

4. The 1943 Writers Congress was sponsored by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization which succeeded the Hollywood branch of the League of American Writers. The program of the Writers Congress contains the name of Edward Dmytryk as a member of the panel on minority groups.

5. The predecessor of the Hollywood Democratic Committee was the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League which was organized by Isaac Romaine, alias V. J. Jerome, a member of the central committee of the Communist Party. The Hollywood Anti-Nazi League was dissolved during the Stalin-Hitler pact. Edward Dmytryk's name appears on the ballot, dated July 26, 1944, as a candidate for the executive board of the Hollywood Democratic Committee.

6. The Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy has been active on behalf of the Chinese Communists and against the government of Chiang Kai-shek. It was cited as a Communist front by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of September 2, 1947. According to the organization's 1946 and 1947 letterhead, Edward Dmytryk is a sponsor of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to announce at this time that by unanimous vote of the subcommittee the subcommittee recommends to the full committee that Edward Dmytryk be cited for contempt and that appropriate action be taken immediately.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, since reference has been made here today to the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, and since the various witnesses who are represented by Mr. Kenney and Mr. Crum all seem to follow a well-defined course, I should like to place into the record at this time the letter which was sent by Abraham J. Isserman, who was the attorney for Gerhart Eisler in the recent trial in the District of Columbia in the case of *Eisler v. the United States*, on contempt action, and also *Eisler v. the United States*, for passport fraud.

Mr. Isserman, as attorney for the Civil Rights Congress, which is the legal arm of the Communist Party, wrote the following letter to the Hollywood Writers Mobilization on January 13, 1947 [reading] :

Helen Bryan has turned over to me your note addressed to her under date of December 19th re Wood-Rankin. Let me briefly bring you up to date on the situation.

The following contempt cases are pending: Spanish Refugee Committee cases, National Council of American-Soviet Friendship cases, case of George Marshall, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

I am associated with Washington counsel in the Soviet Council cases and I am representing George Marshall in his case. We have a working arrangement

with the counsel for the Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee which has resulted in considerable joint effort by way of preparation for trial.

Part of this preparation has been a research project covering all the activities of the Wood-Rankin committee from January 1, 1945, through January 7, 1947. It took a number of months and considerable expense to gather this material and it consists of a considerable number of files containing copies of correspondence, newspaper clippings, releases, Congressional Record excerpts, etc. This material, of course, must remain in our possession, for immediate use. It has not been sufficiently duplicated to provide a copy for your use and the use of others on the west coast. However, the master copy will remain in my possession and if you have anyone in the East who would like to consult it for your purposes that can be arranged.

In addition to this factual material I am about completing a very exhaustive memo directed to the illegality of the resolution under which the committee functions and to the violation of constitutional rights involved. This work too has taken many months and is not now in condition to be forwarded to the west coast.

As you probably know, I was associated with the attorneys in the movie strike and may be coming west, perhaps early next month. If I do I will try to bring this material with me.

At this point we do not have available separate copies of the hearings in the Spanish committee cases or in the other cases. You might try your luck by writing to the Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington asking for a copy, perhaps through some neutral agency.

I might also briefly tell you what our general advice has been in meeting committee subpoenas:

1. We honor the subpoena if it is regular on its face on the theory that we do not flout the right of Congress to issue subpoenas.

2. We generally supply the committee at the hearing with a description of our activity and with written and printed material which might conceivably be classed as propaganda on the theory that we are ready and willing to show that our propaganda is neither subversive nor un-American. At the same time we attack the procedures of the committee and the illegality of the resolution under which the committee functions.

3. We have refused the committee's requests for information on our internal affairs, finances, members, correspondence, etc., on the theory that these matters only become the business of the committee as, if, and when the committee can establish that we are engaged in un-American or subversive propaganda, because otherwise we don't fall within the scope of the committee's investigating power. It is on these matters that we have taken issue with the committee and it may some day be thrashed out in court in the contempt cases.

Of course, in connection with the demand for records the subpoena is examined from the standpoint of whether the demand is legally too broad to warrant compliance.

The organizations have in most cases refused to furnish information pursuant to written requests by the committee or pursuant to requests by investigators who make on-the-spot demands for information or for the examination of files as if these were matters of right. Actually the only way in which such a committee is entitled to information as a matter of right is in response to proper subpoena returnable not before investigators or counsel but before a committee or a subcommittee of the committee (this may be a one-man subcommittee) and at a hearing. There is no need for a blanket turning over of any records.

Also we demand the right to counsel, although thus far counsel has been compelled to wait outside of hearings and witnesses have been permitted to consult counsel on the outside of the hearing room. We also try to put into the record the written statement of our position in respect to the committee's illegal and Red-baiting tactics. Also in such statement we stress the positive activities we engage in and their thoroughly American nature.

I hope this will give some help to you. If you need further advice on any specific point I will attempt to supply it.

P. S.—Some years ago the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties published a pamphlet which I wrote dealing with the old Dies committee, which pamphlet was entitled "The Power of Investigating Committees." The pamphlet gave practical suggestions on what to do in respect to the committee, its agents, etc. It is now out of print, and I have suggested to the Civil Rights Congress that it be revised to fit the current situation. However, no action as yet has been taken by the Congress.

The next witness, Mr. Chairman, is Mr. Adrian Scott.

The CHAIRMAN. Adrian Scott. Raise your right hand, please.

You do solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SCOTT. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

Mr. Stripling.

TESTIMONY OF ADRIAN SCOTT

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Scott, will you state your full name and present address for the record, please?

Mr. SCOTT. My name is Adrian Scott. My address is 603 North Beverly Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born?

Mr. SCOTT. In New Jersey, on February 6, 1911.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. SCOTT. I am a producer.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a producer?

Mr. SCOTT. I believe it is a little over 2 years.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you here before the committee in response to a subpoena served upon you on September 19? ⁷²

Mr. SCOTT. I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. And in response to a telegram sent to you on October 11 by the chairman calling for your appearing on October 29; is that right? ⁷³

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; that is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have a statement, Mr. Scott?

Mr. SCOTT. I do have a statement which I would like to read. I believe the statement is pertinent. It deals with "Crossfire" and anti-Semitism.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. We are trying to read the statement.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. It is hard to read the statement and listen to you at the same time.

(After a pause.)

The CHAIRMAN. This may not be the worst statement we have received, but it is almost the worst.

Mr. SCOTT. May I disagree with the chairman, please?

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, it is clearly out of order, not pertinent at all, hasn't anything to do with the inquiry, and the Chair will rule that the statement will not be read.

Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Scott, are you a member of any guild, either the Screen Directors Guild or the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. SCOTT. I don't think that is a proper question, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you ever a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Stripling, I repeat, I don't think that is a proper question.

⁷² See appendix, p. 547, for exhibit 86.

⁷³ See appendix, p. 548, for exhibit 87.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCOTT. May I answer the first question, Mr. Stripling?

Mr. STRIPLING. You said it wasn't a proper question.

Mr. SCOTT. I will see if I can answer it properly.

The CHAIRMAN. You said it wasn't a proper question.

Mr. SCOTT. I believe it is a question which invades my rights as a citizen. I do not believe it is proper for this committee to inquire into my personal relationships, my private relationships, my public relationships.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you refuse to answer the question?

Mr. SCOTT. The committee has no right to inquire into what I think, with whom I associate.

Mr. STRIPLING. We are not inquiring into what you think, Mr. Scott.

Mr. Scott, we would like to know whether you were ever a member of the Screen Writers Guild.

Mr. SCOTT. I believe I have answered your question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The witness will have to answer the question.

Mr. SCOTT. I beg your pardon?

The CHAIRMAN. The witness must respond to the question by answering.

Mr. SCOTT. I believe I have responded to the question, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you decline to answer the question?

Mr. SCOTT. I have answered it the way I would like to answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you ever a member? I don't know from your answer whether you were or were not a member.

Mr. SCOTT. My answer still stands.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you a member?

Mr. SCOTT. I believe I have answered the question. Would you like me to answer it in the way I did before?

The CHAIRMAN. From your answer, I must be terribly dumb, but from your answer I can't tell whether you are a member or not.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Thomas, I don't agree with you. I don't think you are. I have answered the question the best way I can.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail, can you tell whether he is a member or not?

Mr. VAIL. No; I cannot.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell, can you tell?

Mr. McDOWELL. No.

The CHAIRMAN. I just can't tell whether you are a member.

Mr. SCOTT. I am very sorry.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Scott, could you tell the committee whether or not you are now or have ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Stripling, that question is designed to inquire into my personal and private life. I don't think it is pertinent to this—I don't think it is a proper question either.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you decline to answer the question, Mr. Dmytryk?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Scott.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Scott.

Mr. SCOTT. I believe that question also invades my rights as a citizen. I believe it also invades the first amendment. I believe that I could not engage in any conspiracy with you to invade the first amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, we can't tell even from that answer whether you are a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. STRIPLING. I repeat the question, Mr. Scott: Can you state whether or not you have ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. SCOTT. I repeat my answer, Mr. Stripling.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, the witness is excused.

(Witness excused.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to announce that by unanimous vote of the subcommittee, the subcommittee recommends to the full committee that Adrian Scott be cited for contempt and that appropriate action be taken immediately.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, you have previously been identified and sworn.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have.

Mr. STRIPLING. As a member of the investigators' staff of the Committee on Un-American Activities, were you instructed to determine, if possible, whether or not Adrian Scott is now or was ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give the committee the result of your investigation?

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). May we have more order, please.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the fall of the year 1944 Adrian Scott was issued 1945 Communist Political Association Card No. 47200. In the spring of 1945 Scott was a member of the Communist Political Association and held 1944 Communist Political Association Card No. 46832. In the fall of the year 1945 Scott was issued Communist Party Registration Card No. 35394 for the year 1946.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, according to our investigation, Mr. Scott is a member of the Screen Writers Guild. In fact, he was an alternate member of the board of directors of the Screen Writers Guild.

I have no further information which I desire to submit at this time on Mr. Scott. The memorandum concerning Mr. Scott I think the committee should read in executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. Stripling, will you come up here a minute, please?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. [After a pause:] Mr. Kenny or Mr. Crum, will you please come up here, either one.

The CHAIRMAN (after a pause). All right, Mr. Stripling, next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Dore Schary.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dore Schary.

Mr. Schary, will you raise your right hand, please?

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. SCHARY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF DORE SCHARY

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Schary, will you please state your full name and present address?

Mr. SCHARY. Dore Schary, 12850 Marlboro Street, West Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are accompanied by counsel?

Mr. SCHARY. As a representative of the motion-picture business, I have with me Mr. McNutt, who has been chosen to represent the motion-picture industry.

Mr. STRIPLING. And he is your counsel?

Mr. SCHARY. I don't think I need a counsel, but he is here to represent me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you desire him to be there with you?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes; I do. Thank you.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Schary?

Mr. SCHARY. I was born in Newark, N. J., August 31, 1905.

Mr. STRIPLING. And what is your present occupation?

Mr. SCHARY. My present position is executive in charge of production at RKO.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been with RKO?

Mr. SCHARY. As executive?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Mr. SCHARY. Since January 1, 1947.

Mr. STRIPLING. What did you do before you came to RKO?

Mr. SCHARY. Before—immediately before I came to RKO I was employed by David O. Selznick as a producer. I was with him for a period of 3 years' during which time I produced the following films: I'll Be Seeing You, The Spiral Staircase, Till the End of Time, The Farmer's Daughter, and Bachelor and the Bobby Soxer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Schary, were you ever at any time a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes; I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you also a member of the Screen Directors Guild?

Mr. SCHARY. No, sir; I have never been a director in films.

Mr. STRIPLING. What other studios have you been associated with?

Mr. SCHARY. Most of them. Before going with Mr. Selznick I was employed by Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer studios for a period of 7 years, both as a writer and as an executive, and before that time I worked, I believe, at every major studio with the exception of Twentieth Century-Fox; that is, at the home studio of Twentieth Century-Fox.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like your answer again as to how long you have been associated with RKO-Keiths.

Mr. SCHARY. I didn't hear you, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. I would like you to answer again for the committee how long you have been associated with RKO-Keiths.

Mr. SCHARY. I have been associated with them as an executive since January 1, 1947. Before that time I was on kind of a lend-lease arrangement between David Selznick and RKO. We had a profit-sharing agreement on some films and I was loaned out by Mr. Selznick to RKO.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Schary, are you acquainted with Hanns Eisler?

Mr. SCHARY. I know him.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you ever employ Hanns Eisler?

Mr. SCHARY. No. He was employed at the studio shortly after I got there. His employment was not made by me.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you tell the committee who did employ Hanns Eisler?

Mr. SCHARY. You want to know the actual chain of events about that?

Mr. STRIPLING. That is right.

Mr. SCHARY. He is employed—technically a man assigned to music is employed by two people, one of them a Mr. Dakalienokoff. He is in charge of music. He arranges for the employment of musicians assigned to score films, and a Mr. Leon Goldberg, who is the controller of the studio.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever heard that Hanns Eisler was a Communist?

Mr. SCHARY. I did not hear it until the recent investigations.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Eisler—this committee held hearings on Hanns Eisler for 3 days, and I think the committee submitted voluminous evidence showing that Mr. Eisler had been engaged in Communist activities for many years; that he was the head of the International Music Bureau with headquarters in the Soviet Union; that he had engaged in various cultural or musical activities in the United States which had as their purpose the undermining of our system of government.

I believe it was brought out at the hearing that Mr. Eisler received \$26,000 for various scores which he had written for RKO-Keiths.

Now, as an executive of RKO-Keiths, what is the policy of your company with regard to the employment of people who are notoriously international Communists?

Mr. SCHARY. That policy, I imagine, will have to be determined by the president, by the board, and by myself. I can tell you personally what I feel. Up until the time it is proved that a Communist is a man dedicated to the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, or by any illegal methods, I cannot make any determination of his employment on any other basis except whether he is qualified best to do the job I want him to do.

Mr. STRIPLING. If Mr. Eisler, himself, stated in writing that he was working for the overthrow of this Government by force and violence, would that be sufficient evidence for you?

Mr. SCHARY. That would be; yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will give you a copy of the hearings with the evidence in them—

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. And ask that you read them.

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Regarding Mr. Eisler.

Mr. SCHARY. Where is that, sir? Where would I find it?

Mr. STRIPLING. I would be glad to find it.

Now, Mr. Schary—

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask a question right there?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the testimony that was presented to the Un-American Activities Committee concerning Hanns Eisler and knowing him now as a Communist, and knowing also the record of both Gerhart Eisler and Hanns Eisler, would you as a studio executive be willing to hire him now?

Mr. SCHARY. As I told Mr. Stripling, if there is evidence to support the charge that he is dedicated to the overthrow of the Government by force I would not hire him. I would hire no such man because I believe he would not be dedicated to the best interests of America.

The CHAIRMAN. Just let's forget that for a second, and think of Hanns Eisler.

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have read a lot about Hanns Eisler lately?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you be willing to rehire Hanns Eisler?

Mr. SCHARY. I think, Mr. Thomas—and I really don't want to be evasive, and I don't want you to assume that I am—I can only judge in terms of the record. Now, I have been asked by Mr. Stripling that if, on the record, I was shown that this man had been definitely proven that he was dedicated to the overthrow—that the Communist Party was dedicated to the overthrow of the Government—of course I would not hire him. But I cannot judge that until it is part of a proven record. I think I must do that as a citizen.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Well, supposing it is not called to your attention that the Communist Party is dedicated to the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, but knowing the record of Hanns Eisler—just think in terms of Hanns Eisler—having read what you have about Hanns Eisler, are you willing to rehire Hanns Eisler?

Mr. SCHARY. Well, you get into a completely different area. You are confusing me between a matter of a principle and a matter of whether I would, as an executive in charge of motion pictures, hire Hanns Eisler.

The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about you now as an executive.

Mr. SCHARY. As an executive, I can only repeat and maintain that position, Mr. Chairman, which I think is a very rational position as a citizen. I will hire only those people I believe best qualified for their jobs until it is proven, until it is a matter of record, and if that record is shown to me of course I would not hire anyone who is dedicated to the overthrow of the Government by force.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, but supposing we can prove that Hanns Eisler was a Communist and was very active as an international Communist—

Mr. SCHARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But there has never been any proof, we will say, that he advocated, personally advocated, the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.

Mr. SCHARY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Knowing the record as you do—in all newspapers now—would you rehire Hanns Eisler?

Mr. SCHARY. I have to answer that in two parts, and I again don't want to seem evasive.

One part is that I don't know whether I would hire Mr. Hanns Eisler because of his particular qualifications as a musician. The second, there has been a ruling, I believe, in the Supreme Court which prohibits me as an American to arbitrarily refuse employment to a man purely because of his politics. I believe that was adjudicated by the Supreme Court and I cannot, as an American, refuse that.

What I might feel personally about that would be another thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore, assuming that Hanns Eisler is a great artist; assuming also that he is a Communist, you would not hesitate to rehire him?

Mr. SCHARY. I would not hesitate to rehire him if it was not proven that he was a foreign agent. I would still maintain his right to think politically as he chooses.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever heard of Rip Van Winkle?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir; many years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I want to tell you something. If some people in the United States don't wake up and get out of the long sleep we will find some of the difficulties here that they have encountered in France and Italy and Yugoslavia and Poland and Finland, and some of these South American countries. It is the Rip Van Winkle opinion that has been permitting communism to grow throughout the world the way it has.

That is all.

(Loud applause.)

Mr. SCHARY. May I comment for a moment on that, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Your answers need no comment. They are very clear.

Mr. SCHARY. I don't think you are being fair and I think I should be permitted to comment on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, go ahead and comment, then.

Mr. SCHARY. What I feel about that is this: That I have been opposed to Communists. I am not a Communist. I have never been a Communist. I never contemplated becoming a Communist, and I am opposed to Communists. I have fought the Communist line at any time that I have seen it become apparent. I fought in 1940 when it was very apparent, and I have fought it in any possible way I can, and I shall continue to fight it, but I believe, along with most American citizens, as Mr. Vail pointed out today, that it is not as great a danger as some people believe it to be. I think the American people resent it. I don't think communism has anything to offer the American people, and that is why I don't think it is as dangerous as some people do.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Schary, what is your attitude regarding the Communist Party of the United States? Do you think that it is a domestic political party or do you consider it to be a party which takes its direction from a foreign government and acts in strict conformity with the policies of that government, namely, the Soviet Union?

Mr. SCHARY. Whether it is under orders from Moscow, of course I don't know, but I do say that there is a great similarity, very often, between Russian foreign policy and the Communist Party line in America.

Mr. STRIPLING. There is an exact similarity, isn't there?

Mr. SCHARY. As I say, I have noticed there has been that.

Mr. STRIPLING. You couldn't give the committee any deviations from it, could you, exact deviations?

Mr. SCHARY. Not to my knowledge; no.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, are Mr. Scott and Mr. Dmytryk, who preceded you, employed in your studio?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes; they are under contract.

Mr. STRIPLING. You heard them refuse to answer the question whether or not they are members of the Communist Party, did you not?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you continue to employ them?

Mr. SCHARY. They are under contracts to RKO. They were employed by RKO before I came there. My association with both Mr. Scott and Mr. Dmytryk has been very professional. As an executive I have consulted with them on films. I can only say this, Mr. Stripling, I do not know what these men in their minds are pledged to.

It would come to me as a very terrible shock if I found out that these charges being made here in terms of their being foreign agents are true. That would come to me genuinely as a very surprised shock, but I must say, not in defense but in honesty, that at no time in discussions have I ever heard—or films—these men make any remarks or attempt to get anything subversive into the films I have worked on with them. I must say that in honesty.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, Mr. Schary, you saw them here this afternoon given every opportunity to answer the questions——

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Whether or not they were ever a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. SCHARY. That is right, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have heard the investigator for this committee read the name, date, number, and place of their Communist membership.

Mr. SCHARY. That is right, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. There has been no denial from these two gentlemen.

Mr. SCHARY. That is right, sir. I can perhaps disagree with their method of answering this question. I must say that there probably remains some area of doubt about their right to answer that way. I personally would disagree with their method.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, have you employed at your studio a person by the name of Berthold Brecht?

Mr. SCHARY. Repeat that, please?

Mr. STRIPLING. Berthold Brecht, B-e-r-t-h-o-l-d B-r-e-c-h-t.

Mr. SCHARY. No, sir; I never have.

Mr. STRIPLING. He has never been employed at RKO?

Mr. SCHARY. No, sir; not while I have been there, not that I know of; no, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Getting back to Mr. Eisler again, Mr. Schary. If Mr. Eisler, as one who had taken out citizenship papers in the United States, were to send a cablegram to a foreign government in which he quotes:

It gives us courage in the struggle and binds us to give all our strength in the defense of the Soviet Union.

Would you say that his allegiance was completely with the United States or possibly with the Soviet Union?

Mr. SCHARY. No, sir. If that is a fact, then, of course—

Mr. STRIPLING. He sent the following message.

Mr. SCHARY. Then there is no doubt about that, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. Then would you consider that Mr. Eisler should remain employed in the motion-picture industry? I am not relating it to your studio, but do you think, for example, that a man with the notorious record Mr. Eisler has, and who has written the most revolutionary music, and—I am speaking from the standpoint of words in the music; I am not speaking of the score—

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. If he attacks our entire system over and over again, a man who heads up a bureau with headquarters in Moscow with the avowed purpose of destroying capitalism throughout the world, do you think he has a place or is entitled to draw as much as \$26,000 a year from the motion-picture industry and to write the score for pictures as prominent as *None But the Lonely Heart*, and others?

Mr. SCHARY. Well, Mr. Stripling, as I stated, if this is fact, of course I agree with you and, of course, he shouldn't be.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Schary, I have here a letter written on the letterhead of the Vanguard Films, Inc., Culver City, Calif., office of Dore Schary, dated April 17, 1945. It is written to Mr. Emmett Lavery, care of Mrs. Pauline Lauber, Hollywood Writers Mobilization. Subject: Writers' assignments for Hollywood Bowl memorial program, April 23.⁷⁴ It states:

DEAR EMMETT: I am enclosing herewith a list of the writing assignments of the Hollywood Bowl memorial program to be presented April 23. Following the list of assignments we will state the tentative continuity for the show. We are rushing these assignments to you by messenger so that you can contact the writers. The continuity of the show will follow in a couple of hours after we have completed work on it. The writers who will do the over-all narration and who will be most concerned with the complete continuity of the show are Helen Deutsch, Maxwell Anderson, and Leonardo Bercovici.

Then it states:

Mayor Bowron's speech, 2½ minutes, to be written by Mary McCall.

Do you know Mary McCall?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

County Representative Smith's speech, 2½ minutes, to be written by Maurice Rapf.

Do you know Maurice Rapf?

Mr. SCHARY. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

Federal Judge J. T. F. O'Connor, 2½ minutes, to be written by Faragoh.

Do you know Francis Faragoh?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

Gov. Earl Warren, 5 minutes, to be written by Emmett Lavery.

Do you know Mr. Lavery?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

⁷⁴ See appendix, p. 548, for exhibit 88.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading) :

Note to Mary McCall: Mayor Bowron's speech will open the program and will include the theme of the program.

Dramatization of President Roosevelt's record. The details of this will be discussed at a general meeting for all the writers, 10 minutes, to be written by Alvah Bessie—

Do you know Mr. Bessie?

Mr. SCHARY. No; I did not know him at the time. I knew him after that.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading) :

Leon Meadows and Abe Polansky.

The United Nations Section (this section will also be detailed at the writers' conference), 15 minutes, to be written by Vladimir Pozner and Ring Lardner.

Mr. SCHARY. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading) :

The Human Side of President Roosevelt, 5 minutes, to be written by Harry Trivers, Abe Burroughs, Harry Kurnitz, and Abe Polansky.

The section of the program that will segue from—

Mr. SCHARY. Segue.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading) :

from the memorial to President Roosevelt to the pledge of support to President Truman, 3 minutes, to be written by Paul Green.

Pledge of Allegiance to the Ideals of Mr. Roosevelt and to the Future, 1 minute, to be written by Dalton Trumbo. Introduction to the Pledge of Allegiance, 2 minutes, to be written by Dalton Trumbo.

By the time you get this letter we will have called you on the telephone and asked for your help in arranging a meeting for all the writers this afternoon. Thank you.

Sincerely,

DORE SCHARY.

Mr. SCHARY. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Schary, I read this letter for one purpose. Several of the writers who are assigned here to do certain portions of the program have been identified before this committee as being members of the Communist Party. They have likewise refused to deny that they are members of the Communist Party. If you had such an assignment to do over again, would you call upon men who had been identified before a Committee of Congress and men who had refused to deny before a committee of Congress, to write these various assignments?

Mr. SCHARY. If I were assigned today as I was at that time by the city to do a memorial program to President Roosevelt, some of my selections on that list might be different.

At the time that memorial was written it was shortly after the death of Franklin Roosevelt. These writers were all people connected with the War Mobilization Board and I asked for help in the arranging of this program because we were desperately in need of time.

I can only say again that these men at that time wrote speeches that I thought were very American and very much in tribute to the President. They had nothing subversive in them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Schary, do you think or do you consider that there is any Communist influence in the motion-picture industry in any field, which is definitely a disrupting influence or force within the motion-picture industry?

Mr. SCHARY. I think there are Communists in Hollywood. No one at any time would care to deny that. That has been testified here, and I would be glad to testify that I believe there are Communists in Hollywood, but again testimony has revealed that these people at any time they have tried to dominate guilds and unions have been defeated.

I think the large segment of Hollywood, represented, I think, very ably this morning by Mr. Lavery, like most Americans of a middle-of-the-road group—some of them may be left of center, some right, but essentially middle-of-the-road people.

Whenever the Communist attempts to dominate any organization in Hollywood he is defeated and for that reason, while I believe there are Communists, I don't think they have any weight either in the organizations of Hollywood or in the actual things that appear on the screen.

I think that since we are investigating impartially—and I shall be very happy to continue that investigation impartially—we should talk about the actual things that get on the screen and I think to that end, I don't know of any subversive films ever made, I just don't.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say to you in answer, in the first place, I want to make it very clear that your appearance here today is no reflection on you.

Mr. SCHARY. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We are very pleased to have you. In regard to the scripts and the pictures, investigators of this committee now are making a very thorough study of some of the pictures.

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very likely that in another phase of these hearings we will devote all of our time to just that thing.

I feel as you do, Mr. Schary, that your industry is just like many other industries, there are a number of Communists in it. The influence of the Communists in the industry—the influence is far out of proportion with the number of Communists in the industry, let me put it that way. But the mere fact that it is there deserves our attention. I know you and your associates out there want us to give it our attention. That is our job so we are going to do that, we are going to continue to do that.

Mr. Vail, do you have something?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, on that point, could I—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could I ask you this question, Mr. Schary?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you now producing, is your company producing a picture based upon the book entitled, "Rachael" written by Howard Fast?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, that is a short story called "Rachael."

Mr. STRIPLING. Written by Howard Fast?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes. It was purchased—I think the studio has owned it since 1936.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you familiar with the Communist record of Howard Fast?

Mr. SCHARY. I am familiar with it, yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. He is a publicly avowed Communist?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes; that is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have no objection, then, to producing the works of Communists?

Mr. SCHARY. The point I want to make, Mr. Stripling, is that I did not purchase the story Rachael. That was purchased before I got there. When I got there and reviewed the material there was a script already written, a script of Rachael, and I found it, I must say, a very charming story, not political whatsoever. It is a picture of American pioneer life in the early 1800's and, as a matter of fact, the film has been completed. There is nothing whatever political in it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions I have.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Schary, I have been very much interested in your testimony, and I am in complete accord with your temperate and tolerant attitude. I think we all feel that way, but to my way of thinking a new situation has arisen in America today that is not covered completely by the law. As a matter of fact, this committee is sitting for the purpose of considering the situation as it applies to Hollywood, so that we may get a general picture of what is going on in the country so that it can make its recommendations with respect to legislation to the Congress when it convenes.

It is my thought that the American people, while maintaining an attitude of tolerance, should also maintain an alert attitude to prevent further inroads of this menace to its welfare.

Now, in your own case, you have admitted that Hanns Eisler was employed in your studio for some little time; you associated with him, and yet it took this committee to alert you insofar as the real nature of his activities were concerned; isn't that true?

Mr. SCHARY. Yes. As I said, I did not know Hanns Eisler was a Communist until—or reputedly a Communist. I should say, until this record was shown me—until, rather, I heard it before. The point I make, however, was that he was not employed by me at the time. The question of employment then came up later on with Mr. Stripling. As far as the other points you make, Mr. Congressman, certainly I believe that America and the American people should be alerted and very vigilantly about their prerogatives.

My point is that they are. I believe they are very alert and very vigilant and this is why communism, I believe, has not gotten any kind of a hold politically in the United States whatever. I don't think it has anything to offer the American people.

Mr. VAIL. I appreciate the fact that it has nothing to offer the American people, but when you say it has made no progress in this country, of course I disagree with you. Perhaps we have more information concerning the development of communism in this country than you have.

Mr. SCHARY. That is right.

Mr. VAIL. And certainly we are quite watchful. We are well aware of the communistic activity in Government circles, incidentally. It is our business to be alert to those things and it is your business, apparently, to follow your screen duties. That is one of the reasons why the activities of Mr. Eisler escaped your attention, but they did not escape ours. That is the point I am bringing out.

Mr. SCHARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAIL. And I think we have made you more conscious since your experience with Mr. Eisler and the knowledge you now possess concerning Mr. Eisler, of the fact that Communists exist where you perhaps didn't think they existed before, and if we perform the same service with others, with other Americans, we will have done the job to which we were assigned.

Mr. SCHARY. I respect that, Mr. Congressman. I would only like to make one comment, if I may, sir, that I honestly believe that the people in Hollywood, management, labor groups, guilds themselves, are very, very conscious and very aware of their heritage as Americans. They are called upon by the Government of the United States very often to express and perform those prerogatives.

I just want you to know that our concern about it and our desire to keep all American rights is just as keen as yours.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Schary, and don't forget what I said about Rip Van Winkle. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCHARY. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will stand adjourned to meet at 10:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 3:10 p. m., an adjournment was taken to 10:30 a. m. of the following day, Thursday, October 30, 1947.)

⁷⁵ See appendix, p. —, for exhibit 93.

HEARING REGARDING THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 30, 1947

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., Hon. J. Parnell Thomas (chairman) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order. Everyone please be seated.

The record will show that a subcommittee is sitting, consisting of Mr. McDowell, Mr. Vail, and Mr. Thomas.

Staff members present: Mr. Robert E. Stripling, chief investigator; Messrs. Louis J. Russell and Robert B. Gaston, investigators; and Mr. Benjamin Mandel, director of research.

Mr. KENNY. Is Mr. Kenny in the room?

Mr. KENNY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Crum?

Mr. CRUM. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you please come to the chairman's desk.
(Conference at bench.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will go into executive session. We will be in recess for about 10 minutes.

Mr. Stripling, will you come with the committee?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes, sir.

(There was a recess taken from 10:35 to 10:42 a. m.)

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

Mr. Stripling, first witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Ring Lardner, Jr.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ring Lardner, Jr.

Mr. Lardner, will you raise your right hand, please. You solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. LARDNER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF RING LARDNER, JR., ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, MR. KENNY AND MR. CRUM

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lardner, will you please state your full name and present address?

Mr. LARDNER. Ring W. Lardner, Jr., 325 Georgina Avenue, Santa Monica, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Lardner?

Mr. LARDNER. On August 19, 1915, in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. LARDNER. A writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a writer?

Mr. LARDNER. I have been a writer about 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I have a short statement I would like to make.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you completed the identification?

Mr. STRIPLING. That is sufficient.

(The witness hands statement to the chairman.)

Mr. CRUM. Have you a copy for Mr. Stripling?

Mr. LARDNER. Yes.

(The witness hands statement to Mr. Stripling.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lardner, the committee is unanimous in the fact that after you testify you may read your statement.

Mr. LARDNER. Thank you.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lardner, you are here before the committee in response to a subpoena served upon you on September 22; is that correct? ⁷⁵

Mr. LARDNER. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lardner, are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LARDNER. Mr. Stripling, I want to be cooperative about this, but there are certain limits to my cooperation. I don't want to help you divide or smash this particular guild, or to infiltrate the motion-picture business in any way for the purpose which seems to me to be to try to control that business, to control what the American people can see and hear in their motion-picture theaters.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Lardner, don't do like the others, if I were you, or you will never read your statement. I would suggest——

Mr. LARDNER. Mr. Chairman, let me——

The CHAIRMAN. You be responsive to the question.

Mr. LARDNER. I am——

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, and I will ask it; I will repeat the question.

Mr. LARDNER. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is: Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LARDNER. But I understood you to say that I would be permitted to read the statement, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; after you are finished with the questions and answers——

Mr. LARDNER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But you certainly haven't answered the questions.

Mr. LARDNER. Well, I am going to answer the questions but I don't think you qualified in any way your statement that I would be allowed to read this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Then I will qualify it now. If you refuse to answer the questions then you will not read your statement.

Mr. LARDNER. Well, I know that is an indirect way of saying you don't want me to read the statement.

⁷⁵ See appendix, p. 548, for exhibit 89.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you know right now you are not going to answer the question; is that correct?

Mr. LARDNER. No; I am going to answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, then; answer that question.

Mr. LARDNER. All right, sir. I think these points I am bringing out are relevant to the question because I have to consider why the question is asked——

The CHAIRMAN. We will determine why the question was asked. We want to know whether you are a member of the Screen Writers Guild.

Mr. LARDNER. Yes——

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very simple question. You can answer that "yes" or "no." You don't have to go into a long harangue or speech. If you want to make a speech you know where you can go out there.

Mr. LARDNER. Well, I am not very good in haranguing, and I won't try it, but it seems to me that if you can make me answer this question, tomorrow you could ask somebody whether he believed in spiritualism.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no; there is no chance of our asking anyone whether they believe in spiritualism, and you know it. That is just plain silly.

Mr. LARDNER. You might——

The CHAIRMAN. Now, you haven't learned your lines very well.

Mr. LARDNER. Well——

The CHAIRMAN. I want to know whether you can answer the question "yes" or "no."

Mr. LARDNER. If you did, for instance, ask somebody about that you might ask him——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, now, never mind what we might ask him. We are asking you now, Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. LARDNER. But——

The CHAIRMAN. You are an American——

Mr. LARDNER. But that is a question——

The CHAIRMAN. And Americans should not be afraid to answer that.

Mr. LARDNER. Yes; but I am also concerned as an American with the question of whether this committee has the right to ask me——

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we have got the right and until you prove that we haven't got the right then you have to answer that question.

Mr. LARDNER. As I said, if you ask somebody, say, about spiritualism——

The CHAIRMAN. You are a witness, aren't you? Aren't you a witness?

Mr. LARDNER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Aren't you a witness here?

Mr. LARDNER. Yes; I am.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, then, a congressional committee is asking you: Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild? Now you answer it "yes" or "no."

Mr. LARDNER. Well, I am saying that in order to answer that——

The CHAIRMAN. All right, put the next question. Go to the \$64 question.

The WITNESS. I haven't—

The CHAIRMAN. Go to the next question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lardner, are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LARDNER. Well, I would like to answer that question, too.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lardner, the charge has been made before this committee that the Screen Writers Guild which, according to the record, you are a member of, whether you admit it or not, has a number of individuals in it who are members of the Communist Party. This committee is seeking to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in the Screen Writers Guild and in other guilds within the motion-picture industry.

Mr. LARDNER. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. And certainly the question of whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party is very pertinent. Now, are you a member or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LARDNER. It seems to me you are trying to discredit the Screen Writers Guild through me and the motion-picture industry through the Screen Writers Guild and our whole practice of freedom of expression.

Mr. STRIPLING. If you and others are members of the Communist Party you are the ones who are discrediting the Screen Writers Guild.

Mr. LARDNER. I am trying to answer the question by stating first what I feel about the purpose of the question which, as I say, is to discredit the whole motion-picture industry.

The CHAIRMAN. You won't say anything first. You are refusing to answer this question.

Mr. LARDNER. I am saying my understanding is as an American resident—

The CHAIRMAN. Never mind your understanding. There is a question: Are you or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. LARDNER. I could answer exactly the way you want, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. No—

Mr. LARDNER (continuing). But I think that is a—

The CHAIRMAN. It is not a question of our wanting you to answer that. It is a very simple question. Anybody would be proud to answer it—any real American would be proud to answer the question, "Are you or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?"—any real American.

Mr. LARDNER. It depends on the circumstances. I could answer it, but if I did I would hate myself in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN. Leave the witness chair.

Mr. LARDNER. It was a question that would—

The CHAIRMAN. Leave the witness chair.

Mr. LARDNER. Because it is a question—

The CHAIRMAN (pounding gavel). Leave the witness chair.

Mr. LARDNER. I think I am leaving by force.

The CHAIRMAN. Sergeant, take the witness away.
(Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, will you take the stand, please?

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, you are an investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am, sir.

Mr. STRIPLING. You have previously been sworn in this hearing?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were detailed to make an investigation to determine whether or not Ring Lardner, Jr., was ever a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give the committee the benefit of your investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. During the course of my investigation I obtained information regarding the Communist Party registration card of Ring Lardner, Jr. This card bears the number 47180. It is made out in the name of Ring L., which, during the course of the investigation, developed to be the name of Ring Lardner, Jr., as contained on his Communist Party registration card.

This card contains a notation: "1944 Card No. 46806."

The address of Ring Lardner is given as 447 Loring, L-o-r-i-n-g; city, Los Angeles; county, Los Angeles; State, California.

The card contains a notation, "New card issued on November 30, 1944."⁷⁶

The description of Ring Lardner as contained on the card is as follows: "Male; occupation, writer; industry, M. picture."

The question is then asked: "Member of CIO, A. F. of L., independent union, no union"? "Independent union" is checked.

Another question asked is: "Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker"? The answer, "Yes" is checked.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has prepared a memorandum concerning the Communist affiliations of Ring Lardner, Jr.

According to the International Motion Picture Almanac and other sources, Ring Lardner, Jr., has written the following films: Meet Dr. Christian, RKO, 1939; The Courageous Dr. Christian, RKO, 1940; Arkansas Judge, Republic, 1941; Woman of the Year, MGM, 1942; The Cross of Lorraine, MGM, 1944; Tomorrow the World, United Artists, 1944; Cloak and Dagger, Warner Bros., 1946.

The files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the following information concerning the Communist-front affiliations of Ring Lardner, Jr.:

1. Under date of August 22, 1946, the Hollywood Reporter, a publication in Los Angeles, Calif., carried an editorial headed "More Red Commissars." This editorial is quoted, in part, as follows:

Now let us take a look at another member of the Screen Writers Guild's executive board—Ring Lardner, Jr. As chairman of the Guild's powerful original materials committee Lardner incubated and sponsored the James M. Cain plan for literary dictatorship through the so-called American Authors Authority.

The Reporter has this to ask Ring Lardner, Jr.: "Are you a member of the Communist Party? Are you at present assigned to the Party's Northwest (propaganda) section? Do you hold Party Book No. 25109?" The article continues: "Lardner has a long record of activity in Communist front organizations. The March 1937 issue of The Western Worker listed him as one of the signers of an open letter which denounced the demands of the American Committee for the Defense of Trotsky for an investigation of the Russian "purge" trials. This

⁷⁶ See appendix, p. 549, for exhibit 90.

letter contended that such an investigation would constitute political interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

Lardner and his fellow signers at that time were acting in accordance with the directives of the Stalin dictatorship which was attempting to silence the Communist faction that was loyal to Trotsky. Trotsky later was murdered in Mexico by an assassin who allegedly was a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Chairman, this memorandum continues for 4 pages, listing 12 separate affiliations of Mr. Lardner.

The CHAIRMAN. We would like to have it read.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have it read?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would it be all right if Mr. Gaston reads it?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. GASTON (reading):

In 1941 Lardner resigned his official position in the Screen Writers Guild, after James K. McGuinness and Howard Emmett Rogers had conducted a vigorous campaign against the Communist activities of that organization. But this was only a temporary retreat made necessary by the searchlight which Mr. McGuinness and Mr. Rogers had turned on the Guild's leadership. At present, Lardner, in addition to being chairman of the original materials committee, is a member of the editorial committee, which is responsible for the editorial policies of the Guild's magazine.

In 1942, Lardner was on the editorial board of *Communique*, published by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization, a Communist-front organization, and a member of the mobilization's minority committee, a smaller group also actively engaged in party-line work. * * *

2. The American Youth for Democracy is the new name for the Young Communist League. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947, called upon the governors or legislatures of the various States and the administrative heads of the colleges and universities "to thoroughly expose the Communist connections of the American Youth for Democracy, as well as the inimical objectives of the Communist Party in America." The American Youth for Democracy was also cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report on March 29, 1944. The *People's World* of December 1, 1944, reveals that Ring Lardner, Jr., was a sponsor of the American Youth for Democracy. The *People's World* is the organ of the Communist Party on the west coast.

People's World, on August 17, 1944, contained an article setting forth the winners in a contest sponsored by the American Youth for Democracy. This was a letter-writing contest held in connection with a play entitled "Tomorrow the World," and had for its theme Why Democracy Is Better Than Fascism. The article announced that judges for the contest were Ring Lardner, Jr., Franklin Fearing, William O. Oliver, Rev. J. Raymond Henderson, and Mayer Frieden. It should be noted that this was during the period when Russia was our ally.

The American Youth for Democracy, room 701, 542 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif., published a pamphlet setting forth the work for the American Youth for Democracy. This pamphlet listed a committee which would sponsor the American Youth for Democracy first anniversary dinner in Los Angeles in November 1944. Among those listed as sponsors were Ring Lardner, Jr., John Howard Lawson, Mrs. Charlotta A. Bass, Mrs. Dalton Trumbo, and Edward Dmytryk.

3. George Dimitroff, the former general secretary of the Communist International, was honored by a declaration issued by the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee. According to the New York Times of December 22, 1943, page 49, Ring Lardner, Jr., was a signer of this declaration which paid honor to Dimitroff. The Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944.

4. The California Action Conference for Civil Rights was cited by the California Joint Fact-Finding Committee as being "Communist inspired and dominated." The *People's Daily World* of September 27, 1941, lists Ring Lardner, Jr., as a sponsor of the California Action Conference for Civil Rights.

In the spring of 1946, the Civil Rights Congress, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City, issued a pamphlet entitled "Urgent Summons to a Congress on

Civil Rights." This pamphlet called upon civil rights, labor, religious, racial, and other organizations and individuals to attend a Congress on Civil Rights in Detroit on April 27-28, 1946, to formulate and agree upon a national program to defeat the offensive and reactionary and Fascist forces and to assure the maximum unification of effort to advance that program. The summons contained a partial list of sponsors. This list included the name of Ring W. Lardner, Jr.

The Civil Rights Congress is the successor to the International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party.

5. The American Friends of Spanish Democracy and the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade were a part of the Communist Party program to provide aid and assistance to the Spanish Loyalists in response to instructions received from the Communist International at the Seventh Communist International Congress held in 1935 in Moscow. The American Friends of Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944, and by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the reports of June 12, 1947, and September 2, 1947. The Daily Worker of April 8, 1939, page 4, states that Ring Lardner, Jr., was affiliated with this organization as a signer of a petition to lift the arms embargo which the American Friends of Spanish Democracy sponsored. His affiliation with the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade is shown by the New Masses of April 2, 1940, page 21, which lists him as a signer of a letter which that organization sent to the President of the United States. The Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944, and as "under Communist control" by Professor John Dewey, chairman of the Committee for Cultural Freedom, April 1940.

6. The League of American Writers was affiliated with the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow, and has been pledged to the defense of the Soviet Union and the "Use of art as an instrument of the class struggle." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as a Communist front in the reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944. It was also cited by former Attorney General Francis Biddle in these words: "The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7686). Ring Lardner, Jr., according to the Daily Worker of September 14, 1942, page 7, and People's World of September 23, 1942, page 5, was a signer of a statement of the League of American Writers in behalf of a second front. He was also affiliated with the Hollywood chapter of the League of American Writers as a signer of the cable sent to Leon Blum, President Roosevelt, and Secretary Hull for supplies to Loyalist Spain, as shown by the New Masses of March 29, 1938, page 21.

7. The Writers Congress was sponsored by the Hollywood Writers Mobilization which is the successor to the Hollywood branch of the League of American Writers. The program of the Writers Congress, 1943, lists Ring Lardner, Jr., as the chairman of the panel on minority groups.

8. The Open Letter to American Liberals was a denunciation of the efforts made to defend Leon Trotsky and a reaffirmation of faith in the Soviet Union. It also defended the Moscow trials which were characterized by forced confessions and were staged as political demonstrations rather than trials, in our sense of the term. The Open Letter to American Liberals, of which Ring Lardner, Jr., was a signer, according to Soviet Russia Today, March 1937, pages 14 and 15, was cited as a Communist-front project by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of June 25, 1942. Soviet Russia Today was formerly the publication of the Friends of the Soviet Union and has been cited as a Communist-front publication by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944, and by the Committee on Un-American Activities on June 12, 1947, and September 2, 1947.

9. The Progressive Citizens of America has been described as an "allegedly liberal organization which believes in cooperating with Communists" by the Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of June 12, 1947. It was formed by the pro-Communist group of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions which dissolved because of the issue of communism. According to the Daily Worker of May 16, 1947, page 11, a manuscript by Ring Lardner, Jr., was sold at auction for the benefit of the literature division of the Progressive Citizens of America.

10. According to the Daily Worker of March 31, 1947, page 11, Ring Lardner, Jr., collaborated with John Hubley and Phil Eastman in the writing of the screen version of the Brotherhood of Man, an animated color cartoon produced by United Productions of America for the Auto Workers Union. This film was based on the pamphlet, The Races of Mankind, coauthored by Ruth Benedict and Gene Weltfish, which the War Department banned. Gene Weltfish heads the Congress of American Women which is the American affiliate of the Women's International Democratic Federation. One of the agencies through which the Brotherhood of Man can be booked is the International Workers Order film division. The International Workers Order was cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle as "One of the strongest Communist organizations" (Congressional Record, September 24, 1942, page 7688), and as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the reports of January 3, 1940, and June 25, 1942.

11. The Artists' Front to Win the War, which was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in the report of March 29, 1944, supported the then current Communist demand for a second front. Sponsors of the organization included many writers for the Communist press who had opposed the war during the Stalin-Hitler pact such as Alvah Bessie, Angelo Herndon, Alfred Kreymborg, Albert Maltz, Ruth McKenney, and Dalton Trumbo. The program of the Artists' Front to Win the War, October 16, 1942, page 5, lists Ring Lardner, Jr., as a sponsor.

12. The Voice of Freedom Committee, according to PM of May 19, 1947, page 19, was formed by Dorothy Parker, whose record of affiliation with Communist-front organizations is set forth in a separate report. According to a news release of the organization, dated June 16, 1947, Langston Hughes, Paul Robeson, and Donald Ogden Stewart, all of whom have lengthy records of Communist-front affiliations, are sponsors of the Voice of Freedom Committee, whose function is the support of commentators who have received the acclaim of the Communist press. Ring Lardner, Jr., is listed by a leaflet of the organization as a signer of a petition which the Voice of Freedom Committee sponsored.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, the next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Lester Cole.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lester Cole. Raise your right hand, please.

You solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. COLE. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

TESTIMONY OF LESTER COLE

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cole, will you please state your full name and present address?

Mr. COLE. Lester Cole, 15 Courtney Avenue, Hollywood, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. When and where were you born, Mr. Cole?

Mr. COLE. I was born June 19, 1904, in New York City.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your occupation?

Mr. COLE. I am a writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been a writer?

Mr. COLE. For approximately 15, 16 years.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you been in Hollywood?

Mr. COLE. Since—I first came to Hollywood in 1926; I left and went back to New York in 1929; returned in 1932, and have been there ever since.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to make a statement (handing statement to the chairman).

Mr. McDOWELL. I think it is insulting, myself.

The CHAIRMAN. This statement is clearly another case of vilification and not pertinent at all to the inquiry. Therefore, you will not read the statement.

Mr. COLE. Well, Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, ask the first question.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, may I just ask if I do not read my statement——

The CHAIRMAN. You will not ask anything.

Mr. COLE. Is the New York Times editorial pertinent—the editorial in the Herald Tribune pertinent?

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead and ask the question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cole, are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. COLE. I would like to answer that question and would be very happy to. I believe the reason the question is asked is to help enlighten——

The CHAIRMAN. No, no, no, no, no.

Mr. COLE. I hear you, Mr. Chairman, I hear you, I am sorry, but——

The CHAIRMAN. You will hear some more.

Mr. COLE. I am trying to make these statements pertinent.

The CHAIRMAN. Answer the question, "Yes" or "No."

Mr. COLE. I am sorry, sir, but I have to answer the question in my own way.

The CHAIRMAN. It is a very simple question.

Mr. COLE. What I have to say is a very simple answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but answer it "Yes" or "No."

Mr. COLE. It isn't necessarily that simple.

The CHAIRMAN. If you answer it "Yes" or "No," then you can make some explanation.

Mr. COLE. Well, Mr. Chairman, I really must answer it in my own way.

The CHAIRMAN. You decline to answer the question?

Mr. COLE. Not at all, not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ask the witness if he was here under subpoena?

Mr. COLE. What is it, Mr. Chairman? I beg your pardon?

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cole, you are here under subpoena served upon you on September 19, are you not?

Mr. COLE. Yes; I am.

Mr. STRIPLING. And the question before you is: Are you a member of the Screen Writers Guild?

Mr. COLE. I understand the question, and I think I know how I can answer it to the satisfaction of the committee. I wish I would be permitted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Can't you answer the question?

Mr. COLE. You wouldn't permit me to read my statement and the question is answered in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you able to answer the question "Yes" or "No," or are you unable to answer it "Yes" or "No?"

Mr. COLE. I am not able to answer "Yes" or "No." I am able, and I would like to answer it in my own way. Haven't I the right accorded to me, as it was to Mr. McGuinness and other people who came here?

The CHAIRMAN. First, we want you to answer "Yes" or "No," then you can make some explanation of your answer.

Mr. COLE. I understand what you want, sir. I wish you would understand that I feel I must make an answer in my own way, because what I have to say——

The CHAIRMAN. Then you decline to answer the question?

Mr. COLE. No; I do not decline to answer the question. On the contrary, I would like very much to answer it; just give me a chance.

The CHAIRMAN. Supposing we gave you a chance to make an explanation, how long would it take you to make that explanation?

Mr. COLE. Oh, I would say anywhere from a minute to 20, I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty?

Mr. COLE. Sure, I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. And would it all have to do with the question?

Mr. COLE. It certainly would.

The CHAIRMAN. Then would you finally answer it "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. COLE. Well, I really don't think that is the question before us now, is it?

The CHAIRMAN. Then go to the next question.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Cole, are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLE. I would like to answer that question as well; I would be very happy to. I believe the reason the question is being asked is that because at the present time there is an election in the Screen Writers Guild in Hollywood that for 15 years Mr. McGuinness and others—

The CHAIRMAN. I didn't even know there was an election out there. Go ahead and answer the question. Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLE. If you don't know there is an election there you didn't hear Mr. Lavery's testimony yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. There were some parts I didn't hear.

Mr. COLE. I am sorry, but I would like to put it into the record that there is an election there.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, there is an election there. Now, answer the question, Are you a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. COLE. Can I answer that in my own way, please? May I, please? Can I have that right? Mr. McGuinness was allowed to answer in his own way.

The CHAIRMAN. You are an American, aren't you?

Mr. COLE. Yes; I certainly am, and it states so in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you ought to be very proud to answer the question.

Mr. COLE. I am very proud to answer the question, and I will at times when I feel it is proper.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be very simple to answer.

Mr. COLE. It is very simple to answer the question—

The CHAIRMAN. You bet.

Mr. COLE (continuing). And at times when I feel it is proper I will, but I wish to stand on my rights of association—

The CHAIRMAN. We will determine whether it is proper.

Mr. COLE. No, sir. I feel I must determine it as well.

The CHAIRMAN. We will determine whether it is proper. You are excused.⁷⁷

Next witness, Mr. Stripling.

(Witness excused.)

⁷⁷ See appendix, p. 549, for exhibit 91.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to caution people in the audience that you are the guests of the committee. We must maintain order. We have many witnesses ahead; we cannot have any demonstrations.

Go ahead.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Russell has already been identified as a member of the investigative staff of the committee. He has already been sworn.

Now, Mr. Russell, were you instructed to make an investigation to determine whether or not Lester Cole was or had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give the committee the results of your investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir. During the course of my investigation I received information relating to the Communist Party registration card of Lester Cole. I have a photostatic copy of this card before me. It bears the number "47226." It is made out in the name, "Lester Cole." No address is given. The city is Los Angeles. The county is Los Angeles. The State is California.

This registration card contains a statement: "New card issued on December 16, 1944."

The description of Lester Cole is given as: "Male; white; occupation, writer; industry, motion pictures."

The question is asked: "Member of CIO, A. F. of L., independent union, no union." "Independent union" is checked.

Another question contained on the registration card is: "Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker?" Above that is a notation "PW" meaning "Peoples World." The answer "Yes" is checked.⁷⁸

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all, Mr. Russell.

(Witness excused.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I should like to introduce into the record a photostatic copy of the Hollywood Reporter, August 21, 1946, in which it states:

Let us have a look at the Guild. Other guiding lights: Lester Cole is the first vice president. The other day the Reporter reviewed Cole's political record and asked him a few pointed questions about communism. So far they haven't been answered.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, a memorandum from the committee's staff which lists the various pictures which Mr. Cole has written the scripts for. It is a long list. I also have seven affiliations of Mr. Cole in the Communist Party or its front organizations. I ask it be made a part of the record, or do you desire me to read it?

The CHAIRMAN. All right, without objection, we will eliminate mentioning the pictures there but make sure they are placed in the record at this point.

Start reading the memorandum.

⁷⁸ See appendix, p. 549, for exhibit 92.

(The motion pictures referred to are as follows:)

According to the International Motion Picture Almanac and other sources, Lester Cole has written the following films: The Honorable Johnson's, Paramount, 1930; If I Had a Million, Paramount, 1930; Love Technique, Paramount, 1930; Walls of Gold, Fox, 1933; Charlie Chan's Greatest Case, Fox, 1933; Sleepers East, Fox, 1934; Wild Gold, Fox, 1934; Under Pressure, Fox, 1935; Too Tough to Kill, Columbia, 1935; Hitch Hike Lady, Republic, 1935; The Affairs of Cappy Ricks, Republic, 1937; Beware of Ladies, Republic, 1937; Follow Your Heart, Republic, 1937; The President's Mystery, Republic, 1937; The Man in Blue, 1937; The Jury's Secret, 1938; Midnight Intruder, Universal, 1938; The Crime of Dr. Hallet, Universal, 1938; Sinners in Paradise, Universal, 1938; Secrets of a Nurse, Universal, 1938; Winter Carnival, United Artists, 1939; The Big Guy, Universal, 1939; The Invisible Man Returns, Universal, 1939; The House of Seven Gables, Universal, 1940; Pacific Blackout, Paramount, 1941; Footsteps in the Dark, Warner Bros., 1941; Night Plane for Chumking, Paramount, 1943; Hostages, 1943-44; None Shall Escape, 1943-44; Objective Burma, Blood on the Sun, and Romance of Rosey Ridge.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading). The files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities contain the following concerning the Communist-front affiliations of Lester Cole:

1. While the records of this committee do not indicate that Lester Cole has publicly admitted membership in the Communist Party, it is known that he has supported a Communist Party candidate for election. The People's World of October 22, 1942, page 2, and October 31, 1942, page 3, reveal that Lester Cole supported LaRue McCormick, the Communist Party candidate for the office of State senator in California from the thirty-eighth senatorial district, Los Angeles County.

2. Lester Cole has revealed his sympathies with the Soviet Union as witnessed by his signature to the statement made by American Progressives in defense of the Moscow trials. (See Daily Worker, April 28, 1938.) The Moscow trials aroused world-wide condemnation. They were characterized by forced confessions and were staged as political demonstrations rather than trials in our sense of the term.

3. The Hollywood Reporter, edited and owned by William Wilkerson, charged Lester Cole with holding Communist Party membership book No. 46805 in the northwest (propaganda) section of the Communist Party, according to the Hollywood Reporter of August 19, 1946. To the best knowledge of this committee, this charge was never denied or refuted by Mr. Cole.

4. The Communist press was active in the support of the petition for the pardon of Festus Coleman, of which Lester Cole was a signer, according to the People's World, November 24, 1942, page 1.

5. The League of American Writers, an affiliate of the International Union of Revolutionary Writers, with headquarters in Moscow, has been pledged to defend the Soviet Union and "use of art as an instrument in the class struggle." On three occasions it was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (reports of January 3, 1940, June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944) as well as by Attorney General Francis Biddle, who said in the Congressional Record of September 24, 1942, page 7686, "The overt activities of the League of American Writers in the last 2 years leave little doubt of its Communist control." The People's World of February 11, 1943, page 5, lists Lester Cole as a speaker at the League of American Writers School. Also, New Masses of April 22, 1941, page 25 and the Daily Worker of April 5, 1941, page 7, carry the name of Lester Cole as a signer of the Call to the Fourth Congress of the League of American Writers, June 6-8, 1941, New York City. This conference which was held a few days prior to Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, denounced the war as imperialistic, attacked President Roosevelt and endorsed the American Peace Mobilization which was then picketing the White House, and denouncing President Roosevelt as a war monger.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, without objection, we will suspend with further reading of this report and place it in the record at this point.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right.

(The balance of the statement is as follows:)

6. According to the People's World, October 22, 1942, page 2, and October 31, 1942, page 3, Lester Cole was active in the Hollywood Writers' Mobilization, the successor of the Hollywood branch of the League of American Writers.

7. One of the organizations participating in the Hollywood Writers Mobilization is the Screen Writers' Guild, of which Lester Cole is a member of the executive board, according to the Daily Worker of August 10, 1947, page 11-m and the Screen Writer of July 1947, page 28. John Howard Lawson, who was identified by the Daily Worker, official organ of the Communist Party (issue of August 23, 1937, page 7), as a Communist Party member, is a leading figure in the Screen Writers' Guild.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, the Chair would like to advise that by unanimous vote this subcommittee recommends to the full committee that Ring Lardner, Jr., and Lester Cole be cited for contempt of Congress and that appropriate action be taken immediately.

Next witness.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Berthold Brecht.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brecht, will you stand, please, and raise your right hand?

Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. BRECHT. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down, please.

TESTIMONY OF BERTHOLD BRECHT (ACCOMPANIED BY COUNSEL, MR. KENNY AND MR. CRUM)

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, will you please state your full name and present address for the record, please? Speak into the microphone.

Mr. BRECHT. My name is Berthold Brecht. I am living at 34 West Seventy-third Street, New York. I was born in Augsburg, Germany, February 10, 1898.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, the committee has a—

The CHAIRMAN. What was that date again?

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you give the date again?

The CHAIRMAN. Tenth of February 1898.

Mr. McDOWELL. 1898?

Mr. BRECHT. 1898.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the committee has here an interpreter, if you desire the use of an interpreter.

Mr. CRUM. Would you like an interpreter?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you desire an interpreter?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Interpreter, will you stand and raise your right hand, please?

Mr. Interpreter, do you solemnly swear you will diligently and correctly translate from English into German all questions which may be propounded to this witness and as diligently and correctly translate from German into English all answers made by him, so help you God?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Sit down.

(Mr. David Baumgardt was seated beside the witness as interpreter.)

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you identify yourself for the record, please, sir?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. David Baumgardt.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where are you employed, Mr. Baumgardt?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. In the Library of Congress.

Mr. BRECHT. Mr. Chairman, may I read a statement in English?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; but has the chief investigator completed his investigation of both the interpreter and the witness?

Mr. STRIPLING. No, sir; I have not.

Now, would you speak into the microphone, Mr. Baumgardt?

Are you employed in the Congressional Library?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. I am employed in the Congressional Library, yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. What is your position in the Congressional Library?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. Consultant of philosophy of the Library of Congress.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Brecht, will you state to the committee whether or not you are a citizen of the United States?

Mr. BRECHT. I am not a citizen of the United States; I have only my first papers.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did you acquire your first papers?

Mr. BRECHT. In 1941 when I came to the country.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did you arrive in the United States?

Mr. BRECHT. May I find out exactly? I arrived July 21 at San Pedro.

Mr. STRIPLING. July 21, 1941?

Mr. BRECHT. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. At San Pedro, Calif.?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were born in Augsburg, Bavaria, Germany, on February 10, 1888; is that correct?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. I am reading from the immigration records—

Mr. CRUM. I think, Mr. Stripling, it was 1898.

Mr. BRECHT. 1898.

Mr. STRIPLING. I beg your pardon.

Mr. CRUM. I think the witness tried to say 1898.

Mr. STRIPLING. I want to know whether the immigration records are correct on that. Is it '88 or '98?

Mr. BRECHT. '98.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you issued a quota immigration visa by the American vice consul on May 3, 1941, at Helsinki, Finland?

Mr. BRECHT. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. And you entered this country on that visa?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where had you resided prior to going to Helsinki, Finland?

Mr. BRECHT. May I read my statement? In that statement—

The CHAIRMAN. First, Mr. Brecht, we are trying to identify you. The identification won't be very long.

Mr. BRECHT. I had to leave Germany in 1933, in February, when Hitler took power. Then I went to Denmark but when war seemed imminent in '39 I had to leave for Sweden, Stockholm. I remained

there for 1 year and then Hitler invaded Norway and Denmark and I had to leave Sweden and I went to Finland, there to wait for my visa for the United States.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, Mr. Brecht, what is your occupation?

Mr. BRECHT. I am a playwright and a poet.

Mr. STRIPLING. A playwright and a poet?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where are you presently employed?

Mr. BRECHT. I am not employed.

Mr. STRIPLING. Were you ever employed in the motion-picture industry?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; I—yes. I sold a story to a Hollywood firm, Hangman Also Die, but I did not write the screen play myself. I am not a professional screen-play writer. I wrote another story for a Hollywood firm but that story was not produced.

Mr. STRIPLING. Hangmen Also Die—whom did you sell to, what studio?

Mr. BRECHT. That was to, I think, an independent firm, Pressburger at United Artists.

Mr. STRIPLING. United Artists?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. When did you sell the play to United Artists?

Mr. BRECHT. The story—I don't remember exactly, maybe around '43 or '44; I don't remember, quite.

Mr. STRIPLING. And what other studios have you sold material to?

Mr. BRECHT. No other studio. Besides the last story I spoke of I wrote for Enterprise Studios.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you familiar with Hanns Eisler? Do you know Johannes Eisler?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. How long have you known Johannes Eisler?

Mr. BRECHT. I think since the middle of the twenties, 20 years or so.

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you collaborated with him on a number of works?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, are you a member of the Communist Party or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BRECHT. May I read my statement? I will answer this question but may I read my statement?

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you submit your statement to the chairman?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, let's see the statement.

(Mr. Brecht hands the statement to the chairman.)

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brecht, the committee has carefully gone over the statement. It is a very interesting story of German life but it is not at all pertinent to this inquiry. Therefore, we do not care to have you read the statement.

Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, before we go on with the questions, I would like to put into the record the subpoena which was served upon

you on September 19, calling for your appearance before the committee. You are here in response to a subpoena, are you not?⁷⁹

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, I will repeat the original question. Are you now or have you ever been a member of the Communist Party of any country?

Mr. BRECHT. Mr. Chairman, I have heard my colleagues when they considered this question not as proper, but I am a guest in this country and do not want to enter into any legal arguments, so I will answer your question fully as well I can.

I was not a member or am not a member of any Communist Party.

The CHAIRMAN. Your answer is, then, that you have never been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BRECHT. That is correct.

Mr. STRIPLING. You were not a member of the Communist Party in Germany?

Mr. BRECHT. No; I was not.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, is it true that you have written a number of very revolutionary poems, plays, and other writings?

Mr. BRECHT. I have written a number of poems and songs and plays in the fight against Hitler and, of course, they can be considered, therefore, as revolutionary because I, of course, was for the overthrow of that government.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, we are not interested in any works that he might have written advocating the overthrow of Germany or the government there.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes; I understand.

Well, from an examination of the works which Mr. Brecht has written, particularly in collaboration with Mr. Hanns Eisler, he seems to be a person of international importance to the Communist revolutionary movement.

Now, Mr. Brecht, is it true or do you know whether or not you have written articles which have appeared in publications in the Soviet zone of Germany within the past few months?

Mr. BRECHT. No; I do not remember to have written such articles. I have not seen any of them printed. I have not written any such articles just now. I write very few articles, if any.

Mr. STRIPLING. I have here, Mr. Chairman, a document which I will hand to the translator and ask him to identify it for the committee and to refer to an article which refers on page 72.

Mr. BRECHT. May I speak to that publication?

Mr. STRIPLING. I beg your pardon?

Mr. BRECHT. May I explain this publication?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. Will you identify the publication?

Mr. BRECHT. Oh, yes. That is not an article, that is a scene out of a play I wrote in, I think, 1937 or 1938 in Denmark. The play is called *Private Life of the Master Race*, and this scene is one of the scenes out of this play about a Jewish woman in Berlin in the year of '36 or '37. It was, I see, printed in this magazine *Ost und West*, July 1946.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ See appendix, p. 549, for exhibit 93.

⁸⁰ See appendix, p. 550, for exhibit 94.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Translator, would you translate the frontispiece of the magazine, please?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. "East and West, Contributions to Cultural and Political Questions of the Time, edited by Alfred Kantorowicz, Berlin, July 1947, first year of publication enterprise."

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, do you know the gentleman who is the editor of the publication whose name was just read?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; I know him from Berlin and I met him in New York again.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know him to be a member of the Communist Party of Germany?

Mr. BRECHT. When I met him in Germany I think he was a journalist on the Ullstein Press. That is not a Communist—was not a Communist—there were no Communist Party papers so I do not know exactly whether he was a member of the Communist Party of Germany.

Mr. STRIPLING. You don't know whether he was a member of the Communist Party or not?

Mr. BRECHT. I don't know, no; I don't know.

Mr. STRIPLING. In 1930 did you, with Hanns Eisler, write a play entitled, "Die Massnahme"?

Mr. BRECHT. Die Massnahme.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you write such a play?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you explain to the committee the theme of that play—what it dealt with?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; I will try to.

Mr. STRIPLING. First, explain what the title means.

Mr. BRECHT. Die Massnahme means [speaking in German].

Mr. BAUMGARDT. Measures to be taken, or steps to be taken—measures.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could it mean disciplinary measures?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. No; not disciplinary measures; no. It means measures to be taken.

Mr. McDOWELL. Speak into the microphone.

Mr. BAUMGARDT. It means only measures or steps to be taken.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right.

You tell the committee now, Mr. Brecht—

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING (continuing). What this play dealt with.

Mr. BRECHT. Yes. This play is the adaptation of an old religious Japanese play and is called No Play, and follows quite closely this old story which shows the devotion for an ideal until death.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was that ideal, Mr. Brecht?

Mr. BRECHT. The idea in the old play was a religious idea. This young people—

Mr. STRIPLING. Didn't it have to do with the Communist Party?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. And discipline within the Communist Party?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes, yes; it is a new play, an adaptation. It had as a background the Russia-China of the years 1918 or 1919, or so. There some Communist agitators went to a sort of no man's land between the Russia which then was not a state and had no real—

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, may I interrupt you? Would you consider the play to be pro-Communist or anti-Communist, or would it take a neutral position regarding Communists?

Mr. BRECHT. No; I would say—you see, literature has the right and the duty to give to the public the ideas of the time. Now, in this play—of course, I wrote about 20 plays, but in this play I tried to express the feelings and the ideas of the German workers who then fought against Hitler. I also formulated in an artistic—

Mr. STRIPLING. Fighting against Hitler, did you say?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Written in 1930?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes, yes; oh, yes. That fight started in 1923.

Mr. STRIPLING. You say it is about China, though; it has nothing to do with Germany?

Mr. BRECHT. No, it had nothing to do about it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Let me read this to you.

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Throughout the play reference is made to the theories and teachings of Lenin, the A, B, C of communism and other Communist classics, and the activities of the Chinese Communist Party in general. The following are excerpts from the play:

"The Four Agitators: We came from Moscow as agitators; we were to travel to the city of Mukden to start propaganda and to create, in the factories, the Chinese Party. We were to report to party headquarters closest to the border and to requisition a guide. There, in the anteroom, a young comrade came toward us and spoke of the nature of our mission. We are repeating the conversation.

"The Young Comrade: I am the secretary of the party headquarters which is the last toward the border. My heart is beating for the revolution. The witnessing of wrongdoing drove me into the lines of the fighters. Man must help man. I am for freedom. I believe in mankind. And I am for the rules of the Communist Party which fights for the classless society against exploitation and ignorance.

"The Three Agitators: We come from Moscow.

"The Young Comrade: The two of us have to defend a revolution here. Surely you have a letter to us from the central committee which tells us what to do?

"The Three Agitators: So it is. We bring you nothing. But across the border, to Mukden, we bring to the Chinese workers the teachings of the classics and of the propagandists: The ABC of communism; to the ignorant, the truth about their situation; to the oppressed, class consciousness; and to the class conscious, the experience of the revolution. From you we shall requisition an automobile and a guide.

"The Four Agitators: We went as Chinese to Mukden—4 men and a woman—to spread propaganda and to create the Chinese Party through the teachings of the classics and of the propagandists—the ABC of communism; to bring truth to the ignorant about their situation; the oppressed class conscious, and class conscious, the experience of the revolution.

"The Young Comrade: The individual has two, the party has a thousand eyes. The party sees seven states. The party has many hours. The party cannot be destroyed, for it fights with the methods of the classics which are drawn from the knowledge of reality and are destined to be changed in that the teachings spread through the masses. Who, however, is the party? Is it sitting in a house with telephones? Are its thoughts secret, its revolutions unknown? Who is it? It is all of us. We are the party. You and I and all of you—all of us. In your suit it is, Comrade, and in your head it thinks; wherever I live there is its home and where you are attacked there it fights."

Now, Mr. Brecht, will you tell the committee whether or not one of the characters in this play was murdered by his comrade because it was in the best interest of the party, of the Communist Party; is that true?

Mr. BRECHT. No, it is not quite according to the story.

Mr. STRIPLING. Because he would not bow to discipline he was murdered by his comrades, isn't that true?

Mr. BRECHT. No; it is not really in it. You will find when you read it carefully, like in the old Japanese play where other ideas were at stake, this young man who died was convinced that he had done damage to the mission he believed in and he agreed to that and he was about ready to die in order not to make greater such damage. So, he asks his comrades to help him, and all of them together help him to die. He jumps into an abyss and they lead him tenderly to that abyss, and that is the story.

The CHAIRMAN. I gather from your remarks, from your answer, that he was just killed, he was not murdered?

Mr. BRECHT. He wanted to die.

The CHAIRMAN. So they kill him?

Mr. BRECHT. No; they did not kill him—not in this story. He killed himself. They supported him, but of course they had told him it were better when he disappeared, for him and them and the cause he also believed in.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, could you tell the committee how many times you have been to Moscow?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes. I was invited to Moscow two times.

Mr. STRIPLING. Who invited you?

Mr. BRECHT. The first time I was invited by the Volks Organization for Cultural Exchange. I was invited to show a picture, a documentary picture I had helped to make in Berlin.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was the name of that picture?

Mr. BRECHT. The name—it is the name of a suburb of Berlin, Kuhle Wampe.

Mr. STRIPLING. While you were in Moscow, did you meet Sergi Tretyakov—S-e-r-g-i T-r-e-t-y-a-k-o-v; Tretyakov?

Mr. BRECHT. Tretyakov; yes. That is a Russian playwright.

Mr. STRIPLING. A writer?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes. He translated some of my poems and, I think one play.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, the International Literature No. 5, 1937, published by the State Literary Art Publishing House in Moscow had an article by Sergi Tretyakov, leading Soviet writer, on an interview he had with Mr. Brecht.⁵¹ On page 60, it states: He is quoting Mr. Brecht—

"I was a member of the Augsburg Revolutionary Committee," Brecht continued. "Nearby, in Munich, Levine raised the banner of Soviet power. Augsburg lived in the reflected glow of Munich. The hospital was the only military unit in the town. It elected me to the revolutionary committee. I still remember Georg Brem and the Polish Bolshevik Olshevsky. We did not boast a single Red guardsman. We didn't have time to issue a single decree or nationalize a single bank or close a church. In 2 days General Epp's troops came to town on their way to Munich. One of the members of the revolutionary committee hid at my house until he managed to escape."

He wrote *Drum at Night*. This work contained echoes of the revolution. The drums of revolt persistently summon the man who has gone home. But the man prefers quiet peace of his hearthside.

The work was a scathing satire on those who had deserted the revolution and toasted themselves at their fireplaces. One should recall that Kapp

⁵¹ See appendix, p. 550, for exhibit 95.

launched his drive on Christmas Eve, calculating that many Red guardsmen would have left their detachments for the family Christmas trees.

His play, *Die Massnahme*, the first of Brecht's plays on a Communist theme, is arranged like a court where the characters try to justify themselves for having killed a comrade, and judges, who at the same time represent the audience, summarize the events and reach a verdict.

When he visited in Moscow in 1932, Brecht told me his plan to organize a theater in Berlin which would reenact the most interesting court trials in the history of mankind.

Brecht conceived the idea of writing a play about the terrorist tricks resorted to by the landowners in order to peg the price of grain. But this requires a knowledge of economics. The study of economics brought Brecht to Marx and Lenin, whose works became an invaluable part of his library.

Brecht studies and quotes Lenin as a great thinker and as a great master of prose.

The traditional drama portrays the struggle of class instincts. Brecht demands that the struggle of class instincts be replaced by the struggle of social consciousness, of social convictions. He maintains that the situation must not only be felt, but explained—crystallized into the idea which will overturn the world.

Do you recall that interview, Mr. Brecht?

MR. BRECHT. No. [Laughter.] It must have been written 20 years ago or so.

MR. STRIPLING. I will show you the magazine, Mr. Brecht.

MR. BRECHT. Yes. I do not recall there was an interview. [Book handed to the witness.] I do not recall—Mr. Stripling, I do not recall the interview in exact. I think it is a more or less journalistic summary of talks or discussions about many things.

MR. STRIPLING. Yes. Have many of your writings been based upon the philosophy of Lenin and Marx?

MR. BRECHT. No; I don't think that is quite correct but, of course, I studied, had to study as a playwright who wrote historical plays. I, of course, had to study Marx's ideas about history. I do not think intelligent plays today can be written without such study. Also, history now written now is vitally influenced by the studies of Marx about history.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, since you have been in the United States, have you attended any Communist Party meetings?

MR. BRECHT. No; I don't think so.

MR. STRIPLING. You don't think so?

MR. BRECHT. No.

THE CHAIRMAN. Well, aren't you certain?

MR. BRECHT. No—I am certain; yes.

THE CHAIRMAN. You are certain you have never been to Communist Party meetings?

MR. BRECHT. Yes; I think so. I am here 6 years—I am here those—I do not think so. I do not think that I attended political meetings.

THE CHAIRMAN. No; never mind the political meetings, but have you attended any Communist meetings in the United States?

MR. BRECHT. I do not think so; no.

THE CHAIRMAN. You are certain?

MR. BRECHT. I think I am certain.

THE CHAIRMAN. You think you are certain?

MR. BRECHT. Yes; I have not attended such meetings, in my opinion.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, have you since you have been in the United States, have you met with any officials of the Soviet Government?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes, yes. In Hollywood I was invited, sometimes three or four times, to the Soviet consulate with, of course, many other writers.

Mr. STRIPLING. What others?

Mr. BRECHT. With other writers and artists and actors who they gave some receptions at special Soviet [speaking in German]—

Mr. BAUMGARDT. Festivities.

Mr. BRECHT. Festivities.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did any of the officials of the Soviet Government ever come and visit you?

Mr. BRECHT. I don't think so.

Mr. STRIPLING. Didn't Gregory Kheifets visit you on April 14, 1943, vice consul of the Soviet Government? You know Gregory Kheifets, don't you?

Mr. BRECHT. Gregory Kheifets?

The CHAIRMAN. Watch out on this one.

Mr. BRECHT. I don't remember that name, but I might know him; yes. I don't remember—

Mr. STRIPLING. Did he come and visit you on April 14, 1913?

Mr. BRECHT. It is quite possible.

Mr. STRIPLING. And again on April 27, and again on June 16, 1944?

Mr. BRECHT. That is quite possible, yes; that somebody—I don't know. I don't remember the name, but that somebody, some of the cultural attachés—

Mr. STRIPLING. Cultural attachés.

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Spell the name.

Mr. STRIPLING. Gregory, G-r-e-g-o-r-y Kheifets, K-h-e-i-f-e-t-s. I will spell the last name again, K-h-e-i-f-e-t-s.

Mr. BRECHT. Kheifets?

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes. Do you remember Mr. Kheifets?

Mr. BRECHT. I don't remember the name, but it is quite possible. But I remember that from the—I think from the—yes, from the consulate, from the Russian consulate some people visited me, but not only this man, but also I think the consul once, but I don't remember his name either.

Mr. STRIPLING. What was the nature of his business?

Mr. BRECHT. He—it must have been about my literary connections with German writers. Some of them are friends of mine.

Mr. STRIPLING. German writers?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; in Moscow.

Mr. STRIPLING. In Moscow?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes. And there appeared in the Staats Verlag the Sergei Tretyakov translations of my plays, for instance, this *Private Life of the Master Race*, *A Penny for the Poor*, and poems, and so on.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Gerhart Eisler ever visit you, not Hanns, but Gerhart?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; I met Gerhart Eisler, too. He is a brother of Hanns and he visited me with Hanns and then three or four times without Hanns.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you tell us in what year he visited you? Wasn't it the same year that Mr. Kheifets visited you?

Mr. BRECHT. I do not know, but there is no connection I can see.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall him visiting you on January 17, 1944?

Mr. BRECHT. No; I do not recall such date, but he might have visited me on such date.

Mr. STRIPLING. Where did he visit you?

Mr. BRECHT. He used to ask for his brother who, as I told you, is an old friend of mine, and we played some games of chess, too, and we spoke about politics.

Mr. STRIPLING. About politics?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the last answer? I didn't get the last answer?

Mr. STRIPLING. They spoke about politics.

In any of your conversations with Gerhart Eisler, did you discuss the German Communist movement?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. In Germany?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; we spoke about, of course, German politics. He is a specialist in that, he is a politician.

Mr. STRIPLING. He is a politician?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; he, of course, knew very much more than I knew about the situation in Germany.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, can you tell the committee when you entered this country, did you make a statement to the Immigration Service concerning your past affiliations?

Mr. BRECHT. I don't remember to have made such a statement, but I think I made the usual statements that I did not want to or did not intend to overthrow the American Government. I might have been asked whether I belonged to the Communist Party, I don't remember to have been asked, but I would have answered what I have told you, that I was not. That is what I remember.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did they ask you whether or not you had ever been a member of the Communist Party?

Mr. BRECHT. I don't remember.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did they ask you whether or not you had ever been to the Soviet?

Mr. BRECHT. I think they asked me, yes; and I told them.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did they question you about your writings?

Mr. BRECHT. No; not as I remember, no; they did not. I don't remember any discussion about literature.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, you stated you sold the book, the story, *Hangmen Also Die*, to United Artists; is that correct?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; to an independent firm; yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did Hanns Eisler do the background music for *Hangmen Also Die*?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; he did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you recall who starred in that picture?

Mr. BRECHT. No; I do not.

Mr. STRIPLING. You don't even remember who played the leading role in the picture?

Mr. BRECHT. I think Brian Donlevy played it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you remember any of the other actors or actresses who were in it?

Mr. BRECHT. No; I do not. You see, I had not very much to do with the filmization itself. I wrote the story and then to the script writers some advice about the background of Nazis, nazism in Czechoslovakia, so I had nothing to do with the actors.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, can we hurry this along? We have a very heavy schedule this afternoon.

Mr. STRIPLING. Yes.

Now, Mr. Brecht, since you have been in the United States have you contributed articles to any Communist publications in the United States?

Mr. BRECHT. I don't think so; no.

Mr. STRIPLING. Are you familiar with the magazine New Masses?

Mr. BRECHT. No.

Mr. STRIPLING. You never heard of it?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; of course.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you ever contribute anything to it?

Mr. BRECHT. No.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did they ever publish any of your work?

Mr. BRECHT. That I do not know. They might have published some translation of a poem, but I had no direct connection with it, nor did I send them anything.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did you collaborate with Hanns Eisler on the song In Praise of Learning?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; I collaborated. I wrote that song and he only wrote the music.

Mr. STRIPLING. You wrote the song?

Mr. BRECHT. I wrote the song.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would you recite to the committee the words of that song?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes; I would. May I point out that song comes from another adaptation I made of Gorky's play, Mother. In this song a Russian worker woman addresses all the poor people.

Mr. STRIPLING. It was produced in this country, wasn't it?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes, 35, New York.

Mr. STRIPLING. Now, I will read the words and ask you if this is the one.

Mr. BRECHT. Please.

Mr. STRIPLING. (reading):

Learn now the simple truth, you for whom the time has come at last; it is not too late.

Learn now the ABC. It is not enough but learn it still.

Fear not, be not downhearted. Again you must learn the lesson, you must be ready to take over—

Mr. BRECHT. No, excuse me, that is the wrong translation. That is not right. [Laughter.] Just one second, and I will give you the correct text.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is not a correct translation?

Mr. BRECHT. That is not correct, no; that is not the meaning. It is not very beautiful, but I am not speaking about that.

Mr. STRIPLING. What does it mean? I have here a portion of The People, which was issued by the Communist Party of the United States, published by the Workers' Library Publishers. Page 24 says:

In praise of learning, by Bert Brecht; music by Hanns Eisler.

It says here:

You must be ready to take over; learn it.

Men on the dole, learn it; men in the prisons, learn it; women in the kitchen, learn it; men of 65, learn it. You must be ready to take over—

and goes right on through. That is the core of it—

You must be ready to take over.

Mr. BRECHT. Mr. Stripling, maybe his translation—

Mr. BAUMGARDT. The correct translation would be, "You must take the lead."

The CHAIRMAN. "You must take the lead"?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. "The lead." It definitely says, "The lead." It is not "You must take over." The translation is not a literal translation of the German.

Mr. STRIPLING. Well, Mr. Brecht, as it has been published in these publications of the Communist Party, then, if that is incorrect, what did you mean?

Mr. BRECHT. I don't remember never—I never got that book myself. I must not have been in the country when it was published. I think it was published as a song, one of the songs Eisler had written the music to. I did not give any permission to publish it. I don't see—I think I have never saw the translation.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have the words there before you?

Mr. BRECHT. In German, yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Of the song?

Mr. BRECHT. Oh, yes; in the book.

Mr. STRIPLING. Not in the original.

Mr. BRECHT. In the German book.

Mr. STRIPLING. It goes on:

You must be ready to take over; you must be ready to take over. Don't hesitate to ask questions, stay in there. Don't hesitate to ask questions, comrade—

Mr. BRECHT. Why not let him translate from the German, word for word?

Mr. BAUMGARDT. I think you are mainly interested in this translation which comes from—

The CHAIRMAN. I cannot understand the interpreter any more than I can the witness.

Mr. BAUMGARDT. Mr. Chairman, I apologize. I shall make use of this.

The CHAIRMAN. Just speak in that microphone and maybe we can make out.

Mr. BAUMGARDT. The last line of all three verses is correctly to be translated:

"You must take over the lead," and not "You must take over." "You must take the lead." would be the best, most correct, most accurate translation.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Brecht, did you ever make application to join the Communist Party?

Mr. BRECHT. I do not understand the question. Did I make—

Mr. STRIPLING. Have you ever made application to join the Communist Party?

Mr. BRECHT. No, no, no, no, no, never.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, we have here——

MR. BRECHT. I was an independent writer and wanted to be an independent writer and I point that out and also theoretically. I think, it was the best for me not to join any party whatever. And all these things you read here were not only written for the German communists, but they were also written for workers of any other kind; Social Democrat workers were in these performances; so were Catholic workers from Catholic unions; so were workers which never had been in a party or didn't want to go into a party.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Brecht, did Gerhart Eisler ever ask you to join the Communist Party?

MR. BRECHT. No, no.

THE CHAIRMAN. Did Hanns Eisler ever ask you to join the Communist Party?

MR. BRECHT. No; he did not. I think they considered me just as a writer who wanted to write and do as he saw it, but not as a political figure.

THE CHAIRMAN. Do you recall anyone ever having asked you to join the Communist Party?

MR. BRECHT. Some people might have suggested it to me, but then I found out that it was not my business.

THE CHAIRMAN. Who were those people who asked you to join the Communist Party?

MR. BRECHT. Oh, readers.

THE CHAIRMAN. Who?

MR. BRECHT. Readers of my poems or people from the audiences. You mean—there was never an official approach to me to publish——

THE CHAIRMAN. Some people did ask you to join the Communist Party.

MR. KENNY. In Germany. [Aside to witness.]

MR. BRECHT. In Germany, you mean in Germany?

THE CHAIRMAN. No; I mean in the United States.

MR. BRECHT. No, no, no.

THE CHAIRMAN. He is doing all right. He is doing much better than many other witnesses you have brought here.

Do you recall whether anyone in the United States ever asked you to join the Communist Party?

MR. BRECHT. No; I don't.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell, do you have any questions?

MR. McDOWELL. No; no questions.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail?

MR. VAIL. No questions.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Stripling, do you have any more questions?

MR. STRIPLING. I would like to ask Mr. Brecht whether or not he wrote a poem, a song, rather, entitled, "Forward, We've Not Forgotten."

MR. McDOWELL. "Forward," what?

MR. STRIPLING. Forward, We've Not Forgotten.

MR. BRECHT. I can't think of that. The English title may be the reason.

MR. STRIPLING. Would you translate it for him into German?

(Mr. Baumgardt translates into German.)

MR. BRECHT. Oh, now I know: yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. You are familiar with the words to that?

Mr. BRECHT. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Would the committee like me to read that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; without objection, go ahead.

Mr. STRIPLING (reading):

Forward, we've not forgotten our strength in the fights we've won;

No matter what may threaten, forward, not forgotten how strong we are as one;

Only these our hands now acting, build the road, the walls, the towers. All the world is of our making.

What of it can we call ours?

The refrain:

Forward. March on to the tower, through the city, by land the world;

Forward. Advance it on. Just whose city is the city? Just whose world is the world?

Forward, we've not forgotten our union in hunger and pain, no matter what may threaten, forward, we've not forgotten.

We have a world to gain. We shall free the world of shadow; every shop and every room, every road and every meadow.

All the world will be our own.

Did you write that, Mr. Brecht?

Mr. BRECHT. No. I wrote a German poem, but that is very different from this. [Laughter.]

Mr. STRIPLING. That is all the questions I have, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Brecht. You are a good example to the witnesses of Mr. Kenny and Mr. Crum.

We will recess until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p. m., a recess was taken until 2 p. m. of the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee reconvened at 2 p. m., pursuant to the taking of the recess.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will come to order.

Mr. Stripling.

Mr. STRIPLING. The first witness, Mr. Chairman, will be Mr. Louis J. Russell.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell, take the stand, please.

TESTIMONY OF LOUIS J. RUSSELL

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, you have been previously sworn by the chairman, have you not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you state your full name?

Mr. RUSSELL. Louis J. Russell.

Mr. STRIPLING. Will you give the committee again your past employment background, particularly with the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a period of 10 years. I have also been employed by the Thomas A. Edison Co., Inc., of West Orange, N. J., as director of plant protection. I have been associated with the Committee on Un-American Activities since May 1945.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, there has already been placed in the record Mr. Russell's participation in the present matter under inquiry by the committee, namely, the Communist infiltration into the motion-picture industry.

Mr. Russell, during your investigation of the Hollywood movie industry did you conduct any research work which would reflect the interest of the Soviet Union in the Hollywood motion-picture industry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

In the publication called "International Theater," which was published in Moscow, Russia, as the official publication of the International Union of the Revolutionary Theater, there is contained a great deal of information concerning the interests of the Communists not only in Moscow but of the Communist International in the motion pictures as a means of furthering the class struggle.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, in order to conserve time I ask that Mr. Russell refer to the numbers of these issues and the date rather than to read the entire article into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection so ordered.

Mr. STRIPLING. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent of the committee to put into the record a speech which was delivered by V. J. Jerome in the summer of 1938 to the National Convention of the Communist Party on the Cultural Commission within the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection so ordered.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL CONVENTION IN RELATION TO CULTURAL MOVEMENT

(V. J. Jerome)

(Delivered personally, summer 1938)

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

First report in the National Convention on Culture, an achievement. Hope that writers in the field will make demands on the editors of the Communist.

SURVEY OF ACTIVITIES

(From manuscript:)

Necessary to supplement leaflets and papers with cultural media which should be used by us. There is also the subjective factor—the winning over of professionals to our party increases forces and modes of expression for our agitation and education through the medium of culture. Result: Beginnings of people's culture fusing with the life of our movement in the form of films, plays, recitations, chalk talks, and the like. Our party should remember the use of these things in the campaign of 1937—the use of schools, settlement houses, organized camera clubs, presenting actual scenes of the living conditions of the people in the communities. The East Side Players of New York wrote and produced a play on housing, presented the play to indoor and outdoor audiences, helping to build the Tenant's League. These experiences should be assembled. The section could regularly carry on such work.

In the trade-unions this work is important. Plays such as *Plant in the Sun*, representing through the medium of drama the idea of solidarity, Negro rights, etc. Dramatic presentations facilitate political campaigns in the trade unions by emotional appeal, making it easier for us to come with our programmatic campaigns.

Detroit Automobile Theater has presented a play on Spain to 50,000 auto workers.

In Chicago a play was presented on industrial unionism to A. F. of L. audience using the theme of sit-down strike.

Theater groups developing forms of workers' education. Our comrades must utilize—get firmer grasp of cultural activity. * * *

Think of the fund of cultural tradition that can be exploited among the Negro groups in line with the emphasis that Comrade Browder has given in his report for the general need for vitalizing our activity among national groups. Think of the tasks among the Negro people. In the Negro People's Theater of Richmond, Va., a start was made through some assistance of certain comrades in New York. Harlem Suitcase Theater. Actual demand for cultural equality of Negroes must become part of our struggle for Negro culture. Remove discrimination against Negro people. And remove the condition of making Negroes menials in the hall of culture.

American youth: A special duty on our party, our resolve to give increased guidance and assistance to YCL centering on cultural work.

Work among women: Leadership shown must be emphasized and developed in terms of their special problems.

Consider the children and their cultural demands—winning through them their families.

Basis for these developments in organizations such as Artists Congress, American Artists Union, League of American Writers. Similar work in this field has been done by Theater Arts Committee for Peace and Democracy with its splendid radio division. Note with special appreciation the work done by Comrade Reid in helping establish this organization.

New Theatre League doing educational work in trade unions and mass organizations and which has brought forward a series of excellent playlets before audiences in many towns and cities.

Frontier Films: Its Heart of Spain and China Strikes back.

Associated Film Audiences stopped the showing of *Siege of Alcazar*.

Chorusers, musicians, dancers, entertainment unions, WPA projects: campaign for the enactment of Federal art bill is now in full swing and should have the full support of the party.

Publications: New Masses, Daily Worker, column of Mike Gold.

PROBLEMS

How can we coordinate cultural activities with the movement as a whole. We need a far more positive approach to cultural work: to realize the opportunities of cultural movements that mass agitation offer to our party. This approach of necessity will lead to the solution of the second problem, that of developing cultural personnel in our party.

We have made advances; yet in regard to the opportunities and in general needs we have scarcely made a turn. We have still in our party a certain evil remaining from the past—the evil of pulling up stakes. We should recognize that there is still a tendency in the committees, units, etc., to divert the comrades doing cultural work to assign them to new work. It is an indication of development when a comrade shows himself fit to be transferred to varied activities. We should not discourage such transfers. But we should bear in mind—concern must always be given to condition of the work that the comrade has been doing so there will not be pulling up of stakes, which we have got rid of successfully in many fields of our endeavor.

In dealing further with the question of coordinating the work, we can only speak experimentally. We have done so little because actually we are groping for particulars, methods in building up coordinating activity.

We have had in certain districts, and in certain sections, certain enterprising districts and sections, cultural committees that have undertaken to do work set up by districts and committees. In the course of recent months we have made a survey of certain of these committees. We found in many instances that these committees, while doing certain valuable work, did not always yield the fruits that the planters had looked for; and in examining causes we found that committees were left to drift for themselves. They were invested with too much autonomy. Experience would show us that where such cultural committees are established by sections it is best to regard them as subcommittees, let us say, of the education and organization committees, or if a separate committee, apart from the educational committee, then responsible to the lending committee of the section to which it gives regular reports and a counts of its activities, having its activities placed on the agenda for review, discussion, and planning. Without this they will really be drifting. They need integrated cultural committees. If we examine the way a committee has been set up, we

would find that the organization tie-up is that of integration; but the emphasis cannot be overstated, the work of such committees must be considered a work of importance, of cultural importance, along the central activity of the party as a whole.

Another difficulty in regard to these committees, or to cultural work carried on without committees by some of our party bodies, is the tendency to limit cultural activity to festive occasions, to Lenin Memorial, May Day, and other red-letter days, etc. It is very good to feel that we have forces who come to the assistance of the party and beautify and intensify the party's agitational work, but the time has come when we must register our dissatisfaction with any policy which limits cultural activities to simply occasional entertainment, to gala entertainment, even though it be Bolshevik-gala entertainment. We have to have day-to-day cultural activity as part of the class struggle, as part of the general struggle for building the front of the American people for democracy, for culture, and in doing this the party everywhere will, in the course of time, realize that there is anything to be regretted it is the late start in integrating this cultural work with our general campaign—the minutest day-to-day activities.

The problem that I want particularly to stress tonight is the problem which has caused us real concern in the course of our experience—that of our responsibility to the cultural workers. And we are dealing with human factors. We are dealing with heterogeneous human factors—much more heterogeneous than any other social components of the Communist Party. The Communist Party is a monolithic party. The working class is a homogeneous class but it becomes monolithic to the extent that we bolshevize the membership of our party, make them thoroughbred Communists.

A realistic view of the situation shows us that in the cultural forces much work has to be done by our party, and when we speak of our party I do not mean just the leadership of the party, but every party comrade, both in regard to himself and everyone with whom he comes in contact.

We have won many cultural people to our fold as members and friends and sympathizers, but recruiting, unless it is followed by the next step, the step of solidifying, helping, rendering permanent this recruiting, we have not really done the recruiting; in other words, solidifying our gains in the course of winning these people.

If this is a problem for the party as a whole, how much more is it a problem in regard to the workers in the cultural field, for with their valuable equipment they bring in varying forms draw-backs which reflect themselves in their work, unless we help them to overcome it. Draw-backs that are hang-overs of past environments, past miseducation, past outlook on life and society. Such traits as liberalism, which has nothing in common with progressivism. Speaking of liberalism, or to round out the word, rotten liberalism, such traits as academicism, viewing a topic, an issue, almost with a Hamletic waver, between yea and nay. What has this in common with the Communist theory and practice? But we find it still in our midst—pure and simple professionalism. It is merely a carry-over of an organized notion of our function in which one has not yet learned to make the synthesis between his political program and his professional contribution to the carrying out of that program.

And, of course, hyperindividualism, that direct curse of them all—all of which constitutes susceptibilities to Trotskyism and other alien classes.

Certain examples which will illustrate at the present moment the danger of permitting such notions to remain in our midst. How often do we come across certain individuals mingling with us who advance the following idea about the people's front: for example, that Dimitrov's report finally recognized that they were right all the time. In other words, that Dimitrov's report is a concession to the petty bourgeoisie—the party in the past is now repudiating by the seventh congress line, and now that the party has proved itself worthy they may join it. What does this mean? Can we allow such notions to manifest themselves politically? We have written extensively in our writings and periodicals—Comrade Browder's people's front illustrated for us to see that the adoption of a new line does not constitute a repudiation but, on the contrary, it constitutes a necessary historic transition to a new tactic rendered requisite by a developing situation. Now, he who is opposed to the adoption on the part of the working-class party of the correct tactic stands on the side lines sneering that "They have changed their line." This sneering reflects itself in shadows of grimaces on the part of some of our weaker comrades. We must overcome such notions in our midst. We welcome them (the comrades) but we do not welcome their interest on the

basis of their understanding that that which they are joining is not a party of communism. It is our duty to clarify these comrades.

We have a task to perform; we are educators; we are transformers of consciousness; and that transformation of consciousness does not end with the registration of a given candidate to the party but begins with that moment, for then we have the administrator—the channel through which to do it.

Another manifestation of this—the tendency to abuse and distort the criticism contained in the word "sectarianism." How often do we not find that when a certain liberalism begins to insinuate itself and when it is criticized correctly that very often we find countercharges that criticism is sectarianism. Yes; we have—we hope for good—thrown sectarianism out the window. We have established ourselves as being on the highroad to becoming a mass party. We hope before very long to count our numbers in terms of hundreds of thousands. That is a prospective with a program.

We built qualitatively as well as quantitatively, and we cannot, and should not, permit the charge contained in the word "sectarianism" to cover the employment of opportunism, conscious or unconscious.

To illustrate this with an instance: The book *Red Star Over China*, which has created confusion in the party and around the party. The action of the party in adopting a critical attitude to the book, in keeping the book from circulation in our party bookshops, has not been completely understood by many comrades. I think it should be stated in all due fairness to those comrades that the party did not come out quickly enough with an authentic opinion on the book; and, of course, there were many speculations. It was necessary and imperative to have prompt reviews of the book, to make the matter clear before our members. Of course, the party has an attitude to the book; there were reviews in several periodicals. Here is a book written by a man who undoubtedly is disposed as a friend and well-wisher of the Chinese people. A man who is, you might say, profoundly sympathetic, and attached to the Chinese Soviets, and who wrote a book that is in many pages inspiring. Yet those who have read the book carefully, those who have followed the review in the Communist, will come to the conclusion that the book brings forward Trotskyite conclusions that actually damage an otherwise valuable documentary account. In fact, the philosophy of the book is that communism is adorable if it arises as a Chinese phenomenon. A sort of new exceptionalism cut off from international communism—not only cut off, but Snow's thesis seems to be that wherever the Communist International enters as a factor it brings about tragedy and ruin in the wake of the Chinese revolution. And as for the Soviet Union, that is the villain of the piece. Snow maintains that the Communist International is, or is used as, a sort of vest-pocket bureau of the Soviet Foreign Office. This is purveying Trotskyism. We do not say that Snow is a Trotskyite. We do not say that Snow is a Trotskyite, but we do say that by his unclarity and by his failure, his professional failure, to check on data, a responsibility which he owes to himself as a foreign correspondent, he has made himself a vehicle for carrying Trotskyite poison into his book; and, therefore, notwithstanding the great value of his book in many other ways, we have to register this deep-going criticism in the hope that thereby he will perhaps put forth a new edition in which he will make the corrections that we have indicated.

I mention this as an instance in the party of sectarianism. The word is used by friends and comrades. Why? Because they abuse the word "sectarianism." In fact, it would be extremely sectarian to Trotsky not to have taken the attitude that we have taken to such a word. There is an antitoxin to drive out this remaining poison in the system of certain of the people that come toward us. This antitoxin is the valuable flow of education—of study of Marxism, Leninism, which we owe as educators, as members of the party, to those who come toward us. We have to devise the necessary methods to help overcome this. Of course, we don't mean in the book learning; we mean practice.

Far too many of these people somehow or other are members at large, not because they have been assigned due to their strategic posts that they may occupy in the camp of the enemy, in Wall Street or other places. They have sort of placed themselves at large.

I cite an instance where a representative of the central committee set out to visit a certain group at large to conduct an instructive talk on a vital political subject and he was told that they couldn't reveal themselves. In other words, they don't know us and we don't know them. They missed the study, the work, the activity, the helpful guidance, and the contact with the life of the basic party organizations.

There are two ways for intellectuals to come into the party. One is the way of perennially skirting the fringe. The other is the way to come—weave himself right into the cloth of the banner of Leninism. Every one of us knows what the results of two such ways of coming are.

For instance, I think that in certain places and in certain professions it is advisable to have special units of workers in a given profession established in WPA units, or perhaps units of a given establishment. But, to say, as we have observed in certain cities not farther than a stone's throw from here, that everyone who wields a pen shall therefore belong to our writers unit—and there are such demands I notice, in Chicago, in Philadelphia and here—I think this means isolating themselves from the party. It means a life of inbreeding, failure to live the life of the party. There is no blanket judgment on this. In every district or section the leadership exercises its due discretion to see where in special places professional units can be and should be set up. They have their place and should function where they have their place; but where they have no reason for being, there is absolutely nothing but loss in such an arrangement.

I was in Los Angeles last year and came upon a unit consisting of one or two lawyers, one or two medicos, publicity agents, a couple of storekeepers and teachers. I visited that unit, and I was told that this is an industrial unit. That was not the opinion of the county leadership. Actually it seemed that it was some sort of mushroom growth; and in investigating the basis upon which they had built themselves—they had not a single profession, let alone an industrial profession—the common denominator upon which they existed, I found, was the desire to keep from being open party members. In other words, the negative policy of concealment was the basis for joint work.

Certainly, we have to safeguard professionals. We cannot adopt the same methods of work, nor can we always nor should we always have the general policy of open work, dependent upon who the professionals are. But to say that there can be such a thing as a basis of work which hasn't a positive program, but rather a negative program of withdrawal, is the opposite. Well, as to that unit, they disbanded, and some of them became attached to factory groups and units, helped put out factory papers, and began to find themselves in the party, making themselves useful. They gave their equipment to basic party units, began to register their party attitude to things. Before leaving I spoke to some of those comrades. There was a different light in their eye in speaking of the party.

Promote the party press among our professionals. I don't like to embarrass gatherings of professionals by asking how many have really read the Daily Worker, and I don't mean page 7 only. How many read the Party Organizer? How many read the Communist? Very few, comrades. And where will this transformation come about? Where shall we equip ourselves for further education? * * * It is a very important question. Ask yourselves; probe your consciences tonight. I think if we can all answer in the affirmative there would be a much wider circulation of the Daily Worker and of the entire press.

We must begin to educate through the medium of study groups. The question of study groups is a fundamental problem, of course, not only educational work in the units, but actual study groups where groups of party comrades build around themselves nonparty people, and begin bringing in the policies of our party through a program of education related to the current topics of the hour.

I would say that if the comrades of the section could see their way to instituting such study groups around the professional units it would really be a basic achievement—it would be a preparation for the bolshevizing of the comrades—for making genuine Communists of the entire circle of party comrades and their familiars. The leading committees should actually do the building of these study groups.

And further, we must more than ever impress the professionals—our friends and sympathizers, that we have a positive approach also to their work. It isn't just a question—they shouldn't imagine that they are just brought into the party as though to be turned into instruments apart from their work, but on the contrary, that their coming into the party was their being friends of the party and sympathizers as in terms of their actual work. We do not always make this clear. The party increasingly cherishes and values specific qualities that the professionals bring into our midst. Gone is the day when we just took a professional comrade and assigned him to do nondescript party work. We say, on the contrary, comrades, you have something specific to give. You have the general contributions to make, in your loyalty, in your dues payments, your attendance, and your various duties and tasks to perform. But you have also a

different contribution to make, whether you are a writer, a film artist, a radio performer. We need this no matter how valuable you are to the party on the picket line, and if in your turn you do not contribute, you would not really be valuable to us. This is important to register. And we must also register the fact that the party is not satisfied with anything save the best in terms of quality and caliber and talent that the comrades can produce. Our motto is: Nothing is too good for the working class—and not, as some say, and possibly by their inferior work, not because they are unable to do better, but a sort of sloppy arrangement, that anything is good enough for the working class. We want quality. We want good leaflets, splendid posters, such as the Communist Party of Germany used to put out when artists such as Kathe Kollwitz gave of their best to poster production. And, of course, murals, and everything that is good. We want our basic agitational work to reflect that we have talented professionals in our midst—good sketches, good plays. In fact unless the form is there the content is not there.

I came across something recently—a translation of a poem—Rosset's translation of Francois Villon—"Where are the snows of yesteryear?" An American paper carried in translation of that same line: "What's become of last year's snow?" Is it really the same? The form is not there. And as Marxists, as dialecticians, we believe in the daily unity and interpenetration of form and content.

I was present last night at a cabaret—TAC. I want to say that I think the comrades of TAC deserve a cheer for this innovation that they have brought into our movement; it opens an avenue for very fine achievements. Speaking in terms of medium as to its possibilities, its possibilities are great. There was some fine singing, good schnitzelbank, and yet at the end we had something tacked on the end of the program about Mayor Hague in the form of a round. The form, the words particularly, and music, were nothing to write home about. And I feel that, although the content was intended with the form, especially I was a little ashamed of the thing, because these comrades can do so much better. The content wasn't there because there wasn't that medium of presenting the thing effectively. I say that as party comrades we must be the first to demonstrate that it is not true what the Eastmans say, "Artists in uniform, crushing art out of creation." On the contrary, we have to demonstrate by our creations that we are the ones that are the guardians of art. Quality. Stimulate; criticize. And we demand the best that the comrades can offer.

We have had another tendency, comrades. A tendency—part of the same thing—of utilizing certain names of notables for public statements. Very good, and we need more of such names. But I think, comrades, that if we get these signatures and let it go at that we are not really doing the right thing by these people; for who will deny the fact that if they are prepared to give their signatures for a progressive cause, even for a direct Communist cause, they are also prepared in one way or another to vitalize those signatures into action? Don't we shy off? Just leave them and then call upon them again? We don't want to use these people for window trimming. These are people who demonstrate by that that they want to do something. We are the stimulators. We should draw them. Do we? You will find that very often we neglect these people. To draw them means to draw them to do something. Why can't we draw some of these people and ask them to become pamphleteers for our cause. Have we a great overage? Certainly not.

We can ask them to become poster artists, mural makers. They can embellish our shop papers and do various performances in our day-to-day work and struggle. They are waiting for their invitations. Let's give them a ring. I think we have neglected some very important and useful people in America. We need and we can get cultural workers to temper the press with protests, with letters, to write to Congressmen in behalf of various causes that we promulgate. These are important activities, and these are the beginnings to bring these people closer, and this has to become a systematic activity. Units should put this on the agenda—how to draw these people and for what occasion. This will help to Americanize our work. It will help to bring our message to greater numbers; and not only will the party gain but we will thereby make use of the special talents which are remaining idle in our midst, and we shall be making happier and more devoted party comrades of these professionals. Let us remember that the enemy class bludgeons the masses with every form of clubbing—the radio, press, and so forth. Let us bear in mind the demagogic use to which they are put. Let us not abandon a single cultural field to reaction. The Communist

Party is by its valiant leadership administering its role as vanguard of progressive humanity. Let our party demonstrate its role of vanguard of modern culture.

Mr. STRIBLING. Mr. Russell, will you name the bulletins of the International Theatre which you have referred to?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Bulletin No. 2 of International Theatre published in 1934, pages 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7.⁸² The October 1934 issue of International Theater, on page 3,⁸³ contains an article describing the growth of the revolutionary theater in the United States. This particular article states that such dramatists as Alfred Kreymbourg, John Wexley, Albert Maltz, George Sklar, Lee Simonson, and others are coming over to the revolutionary theater. John Wexley and Albert Maltz have been employed by the Hollywood motion-picture industry.

Page 56 of issue 3 and 4 of International Theater for the year 1934 contains information concerning the training of cadres in the United States.⁸⁴

We might also at this time discuss very briefly an article entitled "Straight From the Shoulder," which appeared in the November 1934 issue of the New Theater, on page 11, which was written by John Howard Lawson, the movie writer,⁸⁵ the comment of the editors of the New Theatre regarding this article by Lawson is as follows:

However, John Howard Lawson's argument that a united-front theater cannot produce specifically Communist plays is certainly true, and he has brought up real but not insurmountable difficulties facing playwrights, whether Socialists, Communists, or just sympathetic, who write for such united-front organization and audience. His article indicates the immediate need for a Communist professional theater that will produce plays as Lawson and others will write, plays with a clear Communist line and straightforward political statements and references.

Mr. STRIBLING. Mr. Russell, can you tell the committee whether or not the Soviet Government has ever sent an official representative to the motion-picture industry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. During the summer of—

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute.

This testimony is very important to the committee. The committee wants to hear every word of it. We will just have to maintain the best order that we possibly can.

Go ahead, Mr. Russell.

Mr. RUSSELL. During the summer of 1943, one Mikhial Kalatozov made his appearance in Hollywood. According to the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D. C., the purpose of Kalatozov's being in Hollywood was to strengthen the artistic and commercial ties with the cinema people of the United States and those of the Soviet Union.

Just prior to Kalatozov's arrival announcement of the fact was made by Miss Pauline Swanson of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 814-816 Broadway, Arcade Building, Los Angeles, Calif. According to this announcement, Mr. Kalatozov was to be presented to the Hollywood film colony at a reception and cocktail party given at the Mocambo Restaurant on the afternoon of August 22, 1943. An article in the west coast organ of the Communist Party,

⁸² See appendix, p. 550, for exhibit 96.

⁸³ See appendix, p. 550, for exhibit 97.

⁸⁴ See appendix, p. 550, for exhibit 98.

⁸⁵ See appendix, p. 550, for exhibit 99.

the People's World, carried the following item concerning Kalatozov in its issue of September 10, 1943. This article is quoted as follows:

MOSCOW LIAISON

Mikhail Kalatozov, Soviet film director, is in Hollywood to give first-hand advice on pictures dealing with Russia and to study Hollywood methods. They are starting him off with a reception at the Mocambo.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, can you tell the committee where Mr. Kalatozov resided while he was in Los Angeles, the address?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes. While in Hollywood, Kalatozov resided at 4744 Los Feliz Boulevard, which is located close to the Soviet Consulate and near the homes of some of Hollywood's best-known stars.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, to what extent did Mr. Kalatozov communicate or contact people in the motion-picture industry?

MR. RUSSELL. During the course of my investigation I became familiar with the content of several cablegrams which indicated that Kalatozov had contacted various motion-picture studios in Hollywood.

MR. STRIPLING. Would you read the content of those telegrams to the committee?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes.

One of these cablegrams was dated December 7, 1943, wherein it is indicated that Kalatozov cabled his superior, Alexander Andreivsky, in Moscow, as follows:

Lawrence agrees to distribute our films in Africa, Italy, France. Agreement advantageous to us. Imperative that we receive immediate reply.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, we are presently investigating this matter and there will be an identification made of Lawrence at the time a report is submitted.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you have other cablegrams, Mr. Russell?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes. A copy of a cablegram which was received by Mikhail Kalatozov on January 20, 1944, from his superior in Moscow, Alexander Adreivsky, reads as follows:

Agreement RKO not received. Will cable after receipt. Regarding radio concert you should receive detailed cable.

This cablegram indicates an agreement with the RKO studios in Hollywood had been reached between Kalatozov and that studio.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you have cablegrams indicating connection with other studios in Hollywood?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes.

In a cablegram dated January 23, 1944, addressed to Alexander Andreivsky, of the cinema committee in Moscow, is stated:

Immediately inform if Warner Brothers films brought to Moscow were seen by you.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, do you recall that several weeks ago the committee held a hearing on Hanns Eisler?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes.

MR. STRIPLING. Did you assist in the investigation of Hanns Eisler?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

MR. STRIPLING. Did you go to California early this year to assist in that investigation?

MR. RUSSELL. I did.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you furnish the committee with some information regarding the association of Hanns Eisler with certain individuals in Hollywood?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

On October 13, 1943, Hanns Eisler and his wife, Louise, attended a gathering in the home of Paul Jarrico, 727 Linda Flora Drive, Los Angeles, Calif., which was addressed by Joseph North, former editor of the New Masses.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. I believe it has been placed in the testimony here, Mr. Chairman, that Paul Jarrico was one of the original script writers of the picture Song of Russia, about which there has been considerable said during this hearing.

Mr. RUSSELL. On November 9, 1943, the Hanns Eislers were invited to an affair given by the Russian vice consul in Los Angeles, Calif., by V. V. Pastoev, who at that time was the Soviet vice consul in Los Angeles. On November 16, 1943, the Eislers entertained the Pastoevs at a party in their home.

On January 10, 1944, Gregori Kheifets, a Soviet vice consul from San Francisco, Calif., visited Hanns Eisler.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the record Hanns Eisler is now subject to deportation, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service has arrested him and he is out on bond awaiting a hearing on a deportation order. At the time of the hearing he was shown to be the head of the International Music Bureau with headquarters in Moscow.

Mr. Russell, did you receive any information during your investigation regarding the brother of Hanns Eisler, Gerhart Eisler, who has been convicted in the court in the District of Columbia for being in contempt of Congress and also for violation of the passport regulations?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

During the year 1940 certain people in the United States were engaged in a campaign to purchase Gerhart Eisler's way out of a concentration camp in France. This campaign started when Hanns Eisler, the brother of Gerhart Eisler, received a cablegram from Gerhart asking him for money which he needed for an operation. This money was actually to be used for the purpose of buying Gerhart Eisler's way out of the concentration camp in France.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you give the committee the details regarding this matter?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

One person active in this matter was Charles A. Page, who was in 1940 a free-lance writer in Hollywood. Also active—

The CHAIRMAN. Now, how do you spell that name?

Mr. RUSSELL. Page, P-a-g-e.

Also active, Louise Bransten.

Mr. STRIPLING. That is Louise, L-o-u-i-s-e, Bransten, B-r-a-n-s-t-e-n?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right.

Both of those persons engaged in considerable activity on behalf of Gerhart Eisler. It is a known fact that Page requested Louise

Bransten's advice as to how the situation could be handled and it was resolved that the best way of securing information concerning the method of handling the situation would be to contact an individual known as Otto Katz, who was then in Connecticut. It might be recalled at this point that Gerhart Eisler——

The CHAIRMAN. How do you spell that last name?

Mr. RUSSELL. Katz, K-a-t-z.

It might be recalled at this point that Gerhart Eisler when he first entered the United States stated before the immigration officials who examined him that he was en route to see Otto Katz who was at that time residing in Mexico.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you further identify Otto Katz, Mr. Russell?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Otto Katz, whose real name is André Simone, and who has numerous other names and aliases, is a known agent of the Soviet Government who was very active in Mexico City during the period of the late war. At present he is in Czechoslovakia. He was also very active in Hollywood at one time, particularly during the year 1935.

At this point I would like to introduce a telegram received from the chief of police in Los Angeles, Calif., pertaining to Charles A. Page and Hanns Eisler.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, was Mr. Page ever employed in the Department of State?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; he was an employee of the Department of State.

Mr. STRIPLING. I will come to that in just a moment. Could you further identify Louise Bransten as soon as you put the telegram into the record?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I will.

During the testimony of Joseph Savoretti in the hearing regarding Hanns Eisler, Mr. Savoretti made several statements regarding a warrant which had been issued for the arrest of Hanns Eisler. In one of these statements he made the following statement, and I quote from the record of the hearing:

The warrants were thereupon sent to our district office in Philadelphia by the New York office under date of August 15 for service. The investigator of the Philadelphia office learned that the aliens had proceeded to 2738 Outpost Drive, care of Page, Hollywood, Calif.

Yesterday the committee dispatched a telegram to the chief of police to determine whether Charles A. Page, who has been mentioned heretofore, was identical with the person mentioned in the testimony of Charles A. Savoretti regarding the warrant which had been issued for the arrest of Hanns Eisler. The reply of V. B. Horrall, chief of police, Los Angeles, Calif., states:

Re tel Charles A. Page and Mary Page. Page registered at 2736 Outpost Drive, Hollywood, from 1938 to 1941.

I believe this establishes the residence of the Pages at 2736 Outpost Drive when this address we requested was 2738 Outpost Drive, Hollywood, Calif.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, will you identify Louise Bransten?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. She was born on October 10, 1908, at Berkeley, Calif., the daughter of Abraham Rosenberg and Alice Greenbaum. She is the former wife of Richard Bransten, also known as Bruce

Minton, former owner of New Masses, and at present the husband of Ruth McKenney, the writer, both of them were recently expelled from the Communist Party of the United States on a charge of revisionism. McKinney and Bransten have both been employed in the movie industry. Louise Bransten's father died in 1929 and left an estate valued at over \$2,000,000. Louise was the beneficiary of a \$500,000 trust fund which provided that \$250,000 be given to her on her twenty-fifth birthday and the other half upon reaching the age of 45. At the age of 25 she made an agreement with the executors of her father's estate to accept shares of stock in a particular company in lieu of \$250,000 in cash. In view of the fact that I have made no investigation regarding the company mentioned I would rather furnish its name in executive session because if the name of the firm is mentioned there might be an unjust reflection on its character.

In 1943, after her mother's death, Louise Bransten inherited a large sum of money, some of which is held in trust.

In June 1933 Louise Bransten, accompanied by her husband Richard, made a 6 weeks' tour of the Soviet Union. During the water-front strike in San Francisco Louise and Richard Bransten carried out assignments for the Communist Party, working with Earl Browder and Gerhart Eisler. In 1944 Louise Bransten made a loan of \$50,000 to the People's World, which is the west coast organ of the Communist Party. She has also contributed through the Rosenberg Foundation, of which she is a member of the board of directors, \$6,000 to the American-Russian Institute, and \$10,000 to the California Labor School. She has also contributed to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee. At present she is living in New York City and is married to Lionel Berman, who is interested in documentary films. Bransten is now employed by the New York Committee To Win the Peace.

MR. STRIPLING. Now, would you identify Charles A. Page?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes. The last-known address of this person, insofar as I know, is the Jefferson Apartments, Sixteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C. He was employed by the State Department from about the year 1928 through the year 1933. During the years 1934 through 1941 he was a free-lance writer in Hollywood, Calif. When he discontinued this type of work he returned to the State Department. He has been in contact with Louise Bransten, Haakon Chevalier, Vassili Zublin, a Soviet diplomatic official, Herbert Biberman, John Howard Lawson, Gerhart Eisler, Otto Katz, and Hanns Eisler. He at one time attempted to obtain a position for Haakon Chevalier.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you know where he attempted to obtain such position?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes; with the Office of War Information.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you know through whom he tried to get the job?

MR. RUSSELL. Through Robert E. Sherwood.

THE CHAIRMAN. Through Robert E. who?

MR. RUSSELL. Sherwood, S-h-e-r-w-o-o-d.

MR. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not he obtained a position?

MR. RUSSELL. No; he did not obtain a position.

MR. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee what commission Page held in the State Department? Is he in the State Department at this time, Mr. Russell?

MR. RUSSELL. No; he is not in the State Department at the present time.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not he was ever contacted in Washington by Louise Bransten while he was in the State Department?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. On January 3, 1944.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee the nature of work or the place of employment of Page while he was in the State Department?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. At one time he was assigned to the American Embassy in Montevideo, Uruguay. During this employment he corresponded frequently with Herbert Biberman and John Howard Lawson, of the Hollywood movie colony. This person was referred to upon one occasion by a leading Communist in Mexico as being "one of our men," and this Communist in this connection said of Page, "We have one of our men right inside the American embassy and we get the real inside dope from there."

I could name the person who said this, if the committee considers it necessary.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, Page was also attached to the cultural—he was the cultural attaché at the embassy in Paris for a while.

Mr. RUSSELL. He was also in New York with the cultural section of the State Department.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, during your investigation of Louise Bransten did you determine whether or not she was in communication with various officials of the Soviet Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

On April 25, 1945, Louise Bransten was contacted by Stepan Apresian, of the Soviet consulate. Apresian was attached to the Soviet consulate in San Francisco. She, Louise Bransten, was contacted by this individual in San Francisco at the Hotel Canterbury on April 25, 1945. The purpose of this meeting, which was arranged by a Mr. Khrameev, of the Soviet consulate, was to arrange for the distribution of 40,000 copies of a speech to be made by Molotov before the United Nations Conference at San Francisco.

On the 24th of April 1945 Bransten was requested to work on the translation of this speech at the Soviet consulate in San Francisco, Calif. Ten thousand copies of Molotov's speech were purchased by the International Workers Order, as a matter of information. The 40,000 copies of Molotov's speech were to be distributed after they had been printed by a particular lithographing and printing company in San Francisco.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell.

Mr. Chairman, we prefer to give the name of the company in executive session.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee whether or not your investigation disclosed whether or not Louise Bransten entertained any of the officials of the Soviet Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

On May 19, 1945, Dmitri Manuilsky, the Ukraine Communist leader, was the guest of honor at a dinner given by Louise Bransten in her home. Dimitri Manuilsky was a member of the three-man board which functioned as the Communist International during the late war. This was during the time that the Communist International had supposedly been dissolved. Other persons who attended the dinner given

by Bransten for Manuilsky were Frederick Thompson, Holland Roberts, president of the California Labor School, and Max Yergan.

Mr. STRIPLING. That was Holland Roberts?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right.

Mr. STRIPLING. H-o-l-l-a-n-d?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. Roberts, R-o-b-e-r-t-s.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, will you tell the committee the various connections between Louise Bransten and persons in Hollywood or the motion-picture industry?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

First, we have the direct connection between Louise Bransten and Charles A. Page, who operated as a free-lance writer in Hollywood for a period of 7 years. Then there is the association of Gregori Kheifets, the Soviet consul, with Hanns Eisler and Louise Bransten.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that Mr. Berthold Brecht, the witness this morning, admitted having met with Kheifets on several occasions and of Kheifets coming to his home.

Mr. RUSSELL. Hanns Eisler, of course, was employed by the Hollywood moving-picture industry. Then there is a tie-up between Page, the associate of Bransten, and Herbert Biberman and John Howard Lawson of the movie colony. Also it might be stated at this point that when Louise Bransten went to New York City in November 1945 she was contacted by an individual known as George George, a member of the Communist Party, and a contact of Hanns Eisler in Los Angeles, Calif. George at one time worked for one of the studios in Hollywood as a free-lance writer.

Mr. STRIPLING. Did he work for Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Mr. Russell?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you at this point furnish the committee with any information concerning contacts in Hollywood, Calif., which have been made by outstanding or notorious leaders of the Communist Party?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

On May 3, 1942, Alexander Stevens, also known as J. Peters, and whose real name is Goldberger, visited Los Angeles, Calif. When he arrived in Los Angeles he was met by Herbert Biberman at the Union Station. During that day a meeting was held by Alexander Stevens, Waldo Salt, and Herbert Biberman. Also on that same date another meeting was held at Herbert Biberman's home, which was attended by Paul Jarrico, Morton Grant, Robert Rossen, and Hyman Kraft. Rossen, Biberman, Salt, and Jarrico are also associated with the motion-picture industry. Also on that same date a third meeting was held by Alexander Stevens, J. Peters, R. Goldberger, as he is known, Morton Grant, John Howard Lawson, and Vera Harris, the wife of Lou Harris, a screen writer.

During the evening of May 3, 1942, another meeting was held in Herbert Biberman's home between Stevens or Peters, John Howard Lawson, Lester Cole, Madeline Ruthven, and Herta Uerkvitz. Lester Cole is a screen writer while Ruthven and Uerkvitz are Communist Party functionaries in Los Angeles, Calif. Ruthven, Lawson, Stevens, and Salt also held a meeting on the same date, late at night, in the home of Waldo Salt. During this visit, among other things, Stevens

was working on the Communist-inspired movement to secure the release of Earl Browder, Communist Party president at that time, from a Federal penitentiary, where he had been incarcerated on a charge of using a false passport to travel to the Soviet Union.

Stevens also had a very successful financial trip since he collected \$1,500, or furnished this sum to Communist Party functionaries in California, which he had received from Louise Bransten. He also received the sum of \$2,200 from a Ruth Wilson, whom I can identify in executive session, the reason being that she at present may have a connection with a leading department store in the United States and I am certain that any mention of her name in connection with that department store would cast an unjust reflection upon the particular store, because I know its reputation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, with reference to J. Peters, or Stevens, I should like to state that the committee issued a subpoena calling for his appearance before the committee yesterday. However, we have been unable to serve the subpoena. It was issued several months ago. He was arrested by the immigration authorities about 3 weeks ago in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

The committee has evidence to show that J. Peters, or Alexander Stevens, or Isadore Boorstein, as he is also known, has for years been the leader of the underground section of the Communist Party in the United States.

The committee has the passport, a fraudulent passport, by the way, which he traveled to the Soviet Union on on October 7, 1931, under the name of Isadore Boorstein. When and if we can obtain Mr. Peters and have him before the committee we will go into great detail concerning his activities.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I would like to make this point, and that is that the Government agencies that we have asked to aid us in getting Mr. Peters haven't been either very alert or cooperative. They have known that we have wanted Peters for a long time.

Go ahead, Mr. Stripling.

But I do want to point out right at that point that the Government agencies that I have in mind do not include the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, did your investigation disclose whether or not Louise Bransten was ever contacted by Gerhart Eisler?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes. On December 29, 1943, she was a guest at a dinner given by Lement U. Harris, of Chappaqua, N. Y., at his home. Gerhart Eisler was present at this dinner.

Mr. STRIPLING. Could you identify Lement Harris further for the committee?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; Lement Harris is high in the Communist Party circles of the United States. He has charge of the party's work among the agricultural workers in the United States as well as the Western Hemisphere. He also has something to do with Communist Party financing in the United States, since it is known that he attempted to persuade Louise Bransten to invest \$10,000 in the Salute magazine.

Mr. STRIPLING. S-a-l-u-t-e?

Mr. RUSSELL. S-a-l-u-t-e.

MR. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee whether your investigation disclosed whether or not Peters was, or Alexander Stevens was, very successful in raising funds among various people in the motion-picture industry when he was out there in behalf of Earl Browder?

MR. RUSSELL. Well, the donations that I know about are those received from Louise Bransten and Ruth Wilson. However, it is known that Bransten—or, that Stevens, or Peters, as he is known, visited a bank with Herbert Biberman and that Biberman entered a safety deposit box in the bank. However, I can't state whether or not he got money from the box.

MR. STRIPLING. He did enter the bank with Peters?

MR. RUSSELL. That is right.

MR. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, do you have any information regarding further contacts on the part of Louise Bransten with other persons associated with the Soviet Government?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes; she has been associated with Vassili Zublin, or the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D. C. She has also been associated with Gregori Kheifets, of the Soviet consulate in San Francisco, and Mr. V. V. Pastoev, of the Soviet consulate in Los Angeles, Calif.

For instance, on May 12, 1944, Gregori Kheifets, Aubrey Whitney Grossman, and John Tripp McTernan, were in attendance at a party in San Francisco which was given by Louise Bransten.

MR. STRIPLING. Did your investigation disclose whether or not Bransten is an important figure in the Communist set-up in the United States?

MR. RUSSELL. Bransten is what would be termed in a confidence game racket as the sharper or the loader. That is, in Communist Party circles she directs the manner in which contacts with certain people are to be made, whether or not these persons are connected with the Communist Party of the United States or other countries, or whether they are connected with the Communist Party at all. She has contacts, did have them, in numerous Government agencies. However, there are so many names that—

MR. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Russell, on that point. Could you tell the committee whether or not Louise Bransten was in communication or put in communication with certain individuals who were approached by an agent of the Soviet Government, or representatives of the Soviet Government, regarding certain espionage activities?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes. Louise Bransten was closely associated with Peter Ivanov, the Russian vice consul in San Francisco, Calif. He was also a secretary in that consulate. I understand Mr. Ivanov has returned to Soviet Russia. I have some information regarding his stay in the consulate at San Francisco, Calif., if you want it read into the record.

MR. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee whether or not Louise Bransten was associated with a man by the name of George Charles Eltenton?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes; she was very closely associated with George Charles Eltenton, and his wife Dolly.

MR. STRIPLING. Could you identify George Charles Eltenton?

MR. RUSSELL. Yes; Charles Eltenton was an employee of the Shell Development Corp. in Emoryville, Calif., from 1938, and I know that during, that is, as late as July 1946. He possibly is still employed there.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not George Charles Eltenton ever made any trips to the Soviet Union?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it is known that he spent some time in Soviet Russia and that he lived in the vicinity of Leningrad. While there he became very familiar with the Russian language and as the result was asked to translate several Russian works into the English language.

For instance, he was requested to translate a book written by a Victor Konratiev, a book written by V. Konratiev, entitled, "The Free Hydroylem." Konratiev is a friend of Joffe, who developed the first atom smashing machine in the Soviet.

Mr. Eltenton, along with his wife Dolly, attended a party given by Louise Bransten on November 10, 1944, and at the time Eltenton was trying to educate a scientist along Soviet lines since he had loaned this particular scientist a copy of the Soviet Constitution which he asked him to read. I can identify that scientist if necessary.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was this scientist employed at the radiation laboratory in California?

Mr. RUSSELL. He was employed at the radiation laboratory at the University of California.

Mr. STRIPLING. At Berkeley?

Mr. RUSSELL. At Berkeley.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not Eltenton attended a reception in the honor of Molotov in the St. Francis Hotel in San Francisco on May 7, 1945?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; he did attend the reception for Molotov in the St. Francis Hotel on May 7, 1945, during which he held quite a conversation with Mr. Molotov.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you have any information regarding further association between Bransten, Louise Bransten, and Eltenton?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; it is known that Louise Bransten at one time attempted to secure employment for Dolly Eltenton with the American-Russian Institute through Gregory Kheifets. Also Louise Bransten requested Eltenton to send a telegram of congratulations to a Russian scientific society in the Soviet Union and during the month of July 1940, it was sent. The person in charge of this scientific gathering in Soviet Russia was an individual known as Peter Kapitza.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, tell the committee whether or not Eltenton was ever contacted by an official of the Soviet Government regarding espionage activity.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; during the year 1942, the latter part, Eltenton was contacted by Peter Ivanov, whom I have identified as a vice consul of the Soviet Government and a secretary in its consulate in San Francisco. Ivanov requested Eltenton to secure information concerning some highly secret work which was being carried on at the radiation laboratory at the University of California. Ivanov offered Eltenton money in return for his cooperation in securing information regarding the secret work which was being conducted at the University of California and Berkeley in its radiation laboratory.

Mr. STRIPLING. Do you know whether or not Eltenton, in furtherance of this offer, contacted anyone else?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; in order to cooperate with Ivanov he approached Haakon Chevalier, who was a professor at the University of California—

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment. Is he the same person who was a writer in the film industry for several years?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no information concerning his occupation in the film industry.

Mr. STRIPLING. All right, proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. And requested him to find out what was being done at the radiation laboratory, particularly information regarding the highly destructive weapon which was being developed through research. Eltenton told Chevalier that he had a line of communication with an official of the Soviet Government who had advised him that since Russia and the United States were allies Soviet Russia should be entitled to any technical data which might be of assistance to that nation.

At the time of this particular conversation Chevalier advised Eltenton that he would contact a third person who was working in the radiation laboratory and attempt to secure information regarding the type of work conducted there or any information which he could regarding technical developments which might be of assistance to the Soviet Government.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Russell, can you tell the committee whether or not Mr. Chevalier did contact a scientist employed in the radiation laboratory?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; Chevalier approached this third person.

Mr. STRIPLING. Was that third person J. Robert Oppenheimer?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right; Chevalier approached this third person, J. Robert Oppenheimer, and told him that George Charles Eltenton was interested in obtaining information regarding technical developments under consideration by the United States and also that Eltenton was interested in obtaining information regarding the work being performed at the radiation laboratory at the University of California. This third person—

Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment. Did Chevalier tell J. Robert Oppenheimer that he had the means of communication whereby he could transmit such information to the Soviet Union?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; he did. He told J. Robert Oppenheimer that Eltenton had a source through which he could relay the information to the Soviet Government.

Mr. STRIPLING. What did Mr. Oppenheimer reply to this approach on the part of Mr. Chevalier?

Mr. RUSSELL. He said that he considered such attempts as this to secure information a treasonable act and that he certainly would not have anything to do with such a thing.

Mr. STRIPLING. Can you tell the committee whether or not J. Robert Oppenheimer subsequently worked on the atomic project at Los Alamos, N. Mex., in the development of the atomic bomb?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; he did. He was in charge of it.

Mr. STRIPLING. Mr. Chairman, there are further questions here regarding this matter which involve various individuals which I think that the committee should consider in executive session before we make their names public.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. STRIPLING. Those are all the questions that I have at this time from Mr. Russell.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. McDowell.

Mr. McDOWELL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vail.

Mr. VAIL. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Russell, just sit right there, please.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to make this statement.

The hearings today conclude the first phase of the committee's investigation of communism in the motion-picture industry. While we have heard 39 witnesses, there are many more to be heard. The Chair stated earlier in the hearing he would present the records of 79 prominent people associated with the motion-picture industry who were members of the Communist Party or who had records of Communist affiliations. We have had before us 11 of these individuals. There are 68 to go. This hearing has concerned itself principally with spotlighting Communist personnel in the industry.

There is, however, an equally dangerous phase of this inquiry which deals with Communist propaganda in various motion pictures and the techniques employed. At the present time the committee has a special staff making an extensive study of this phase of the committee's inquiry. Either the full committee or a subcommittee will resume hearings on this matter in the near future, either in Washington or in Los Angeles, at which time those persons whose Communist records the committee has will be given an opportunity to appear before the committee to confirm or deny those affiliations. We will also have a number of witnesses who will deal with propaganda in the films and the techniques employed.

I want to emphasize that the committee is not adjourning sine die, but will resume hearings as soon as possible. The committee hearings for the past 2 weeks have clearly shown the need for this investigation. Ten prominent figures in Hollywood whom the committee had evidence were members of the Communist Party were brought before us and refused to deny that they were Communists. It is not necessary for the Chair to emphasize the harm which the motion-picture industry suffers from the presence within its ranks of known Communists who do not have the best interests of the United States at heart. The industry should set about immediately to clean its own house and not wait for public opinion to force it to do so.

The hearings are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 3 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

APPENDIX

The following were introduced with testimony in the course of the hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities, October 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, and 30, 1947, and are retained in the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities as exhibits:

Exhibit 1. Statement of Jack L. Warner.

Exhibit 2. Testimony of Jack L. Warner in executive session before the Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, May 15, 1947, in Los Angeles, Calif.

Exhibit 3. List of 43 films introduced by Jack L. Warner.

Exhibit 4. Motion Picture News, March 23, 1918; review written by Peter Milne of the film, *My Four Years in Germany*, based on book under same title by James W. Gerard.

Exhibit 5. List of 39 films, pro-American short subjects, submitted by Jack L. Warner.

Exhibit 6. Statement by Senator Martin, of Pennsylvania, United States Senate, Congressional Record, July 16, 1947, on education in patriotism through motion pictures.

Exhibit 7. List of 26 pro-American short subject films produced by Warner Bros. studio in cooperation with the United States Armed Forces.

Exhibit 8. New York Times, December 8, 1941, page 1; January 3, 1942, page 1; January 7, 1942, page 1; January 23, 1942, page 1; February 11, 1942, page 1; February 16, 1942, page 1; February 19, 1942, page 1; March 2, 1942, page 1; March 10, 1942, page 1; March 15, 1942, page 1; March 27, 1942, page 1; April 9, 1942, page 1; April 10, 1942, page 1; May 1, 1942, page 1; May 7, 1942, page 1; May 12, 1942, page 1; May 27, 1942, page 1; June 5, 1942, page 1; June 8, 1942, page 1; June 12, 1942, page 1; June 13, 1942, page 6; June 22, 1942, page 1; July 2, 1942, page 1; July 11, 1942, page 1; July 25, 1942, page 1; August 8, 1942, page 1; August 19, 1942, page 1; August 26, 1942, page 1; September 1, 1942, page 1; September 9, 1942, page 1; September 10, 1942, page 1; September 13, 1942, page 1; September 17, 1942, page 1; September 27, 1942, page 1; October 5, 1942, page 1; October 13, 1942, page 1; October 17, 1942, page 1; October 27, 1942, page 1; November 8, 1942, page 1; November 23, 1942, page 1; December 5, 1942, page 1; December 20, 1942, page 1; December 22, 1942, page 1; December 30, 1942, page 1.

Exhibit 9. Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., Employment Application and Personnel Record, first used in 1936.

Exhibit 10. Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc., Employment Application and Personnel Record, first used in 1941.

Exhibit 11. Photograph showing John Howard Lawson in film-strike picket line at Warner Bros. in 1945.

Exhibit 12. Pamphlet issued by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

Exhibit 13. Leaflet, *Who's Next*, in connection with the film strike in 1945, issued by the Communist Party of Los Angeles County.

Exhibit 14. Flyer, *The Issue in the Strike*, issued to picket lines in the film strike of 1945 by the North Hollywood Communist Club.

Exhibit 15. New Masses, October 23, 1945, page 20, open letter to Jack Warner.

Exhibit 16. IATSE Bulletin, November 2, 1945, Los Angeles, Calif.

Exhibit 17. IATSE Bulletin, November 13, 1945, Los Angeles, Calif.

EXHIBIT 18. SUBPENA—JACK L. WARNER

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Jack L. Warner, Warner Bros. Studios, 4000 W. Olive, Burbank, California (business), to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of — then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 19. SUBPENA—SAM WOOD

Marshal's Civil Docket No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Sam Wood, Universal Studios, Universal City, California (business), to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of — then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 20. SUBPENA—LOUIS B. MAYER

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Louis B. Mayer, 910 Benedict Canyon Road (residence); Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Culver City (business), to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, Forthwith, at the hour of — then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 21. Statement of Louis B. Mayer.

Exhibit 22. Loew's Inc., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures, salary paid and scripts worked on by Dalton Trumbo from 1943 to October 4, 1947.

Exhibit 23. Loew's Inc., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures, salary paid and scripts worked on by Lester Cole from 1945 to October 4, 1947.

Exhibit 24. Loew's Inc., Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Pictures, salary paid and scripts worked on by Donald Ogden Stewart from 1943 to October 4, 1947.

Exhibit 25. Congressional Record, July 15, 1947, page 3727, copy of address made by Mr. Louis B. Mayer before the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association, San Francisco, July 7, 1947.

Exhibit 26. Letter: Ayn Rand to the Committee on Un-American Activities, November 1, 1947.

EXHIBIT 27. SUBPENA—ADOLPH MENJOU

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Adolphe Jean Menjou, 722 North Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills, California (residence) to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, Forthwith, at the hour of -----, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 28. Photostatic copies of Communist Party documents and exemplars of the handwriting of Herbert K. Sorrell in connection with the testimony of the noted examiners of questioned documents: Clark Sellers and John L. Harris * * * before the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities in California of the California Legislature, at hearings in Los Angeles, Calif., January 4, 1946.

29. SUBPENA—JOHN CHARLES MOFFITT

Marshal's Civil Docket
No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon John C. Moffitt, 463 S. McCadden, Los Angeles (residence) to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ----- then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September, 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNEIL THOMAS,

Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 30. LETTER

New York

London
Executive Offices

Chicago
Telephone Circle 7-2160
Established 1898

Hollywood

WILLIAM MORRIS AGENCY, INC.

Rockefeller Center, 1270 Sixth Avenue, New York 20, N. Y.

OCTOBER 27, 1947.

Mr. J. P. THOMAS,

Chairman, House Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On behalf of John Weber of California I am handing you herewith a photostatic copy of a sworn-to statement made by him. I am also including a photostatic copy of a similarly sworn-to statement by Helen Straus of New York. I will send to you the originals of these statements as soon as I can have copies of them made for the members of your committee.

I ask that you immediately place these statements into the record of the present hearings and that you acknowledge to me at my office at the address above given, that this has been done.

Yours truly,

William Morris (Signed).

WILLIAM MORRIS, *President.*

Cable: "Willmorris" New York. "Willholt" Hollywood.

EXHIBIT 31. AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,

County of Los Angeles, ss:

JOHN WEBER, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am a resident of Los Angeles, California, and a literary agent employed as such by the William Morris Agency, Inc., since shortly after my honorable discharge from the Army on October 28, 1944.

Around the beginning of the year 1947 I met Chalmers "Slick" Goodlin, who was introduced to me as a client of the William Morris Agency, Inc. At this time Mr. Goodlin advised me that he was interested in securing publication of material concerning his exploits as a rocket pilot. He also told me of interviews which he had had concerning this in the past with a number of magazines, including Time, Newsweek, Life Magazine, and the American Magazine, and he stated that other national magazines, such as Collier's Magazine and Look Magazine appeared interested in securing articles. I told him that I thought that the market for such magazine stories should be very good, and I assured him that my associates who handle magazine matters would do everything they could to help him.

Since this meeting I have only met Goodlin on no more than one or two other occasions when he happened to be in the office to discuss his business affairs with the persons in the office who were handling them. In these conversations, which were very brief, I merely inquired how things were progressing in a very general way, and he seemed to be optimistic concerning the possibility of publication. He did not in any of my conversations with him ever give me any written material, nor did he orally discuss in any detail his material or his experiences as a test pilot. I understand that Mr. Goodlin did submit to my associates certain written material which he had prepared with the knowledge of the Army Air Forces and Bell Aircraft Corporation, and that this material, which was never read by me and which was not, in fact, sold through me or the William Morris Agency, Inc., is appearing in the January issue of Air Trails Magazine and in a condensed version in Reader's Digest for that month.

I am attaching herewith a newspaper report of the true facts as related by Goodlin to the Los Angeles Herald Express on October 22, 1947.

I categorically deny the entire story reported in the local newspapers as the testimony of John C. Moffitt before the House Un-American Activities Committee that I obtained or attempted to obtain from Chalmers "Slick" Goodlin secrets

concerning the supersonic experimental plane, the XS-1, and that such secrets were communicated by me to Communist Headquarters.

The statements attributed to Mr. Moffitt are entirely and completely false.

(s) John Weber.

JOHN WEBER.

Sworn and subscribed to before me, Pearl Leiba, this 22nd day of October 1947.

(s) Pearl S. Leiber,

PEARL LEIBA,

Notary Public, Los Angeles, State of California.

My Commission expires Aug. 21, 1951.

[Clipping, Express, October 2. (s) John Weber. (s) Pearl S. Leiba]

TEST PILOT DENIES SECRET DATA ON STORIES ON U. S. PLANE

Test Pilot Chalmers "Slick" Goodlin emphatically denied today that the aviation article he wrote contained any secret information on supersonic bombers and declared it was cleared by the Army Air Force in Washington, D. C.

Writer John Charles Moffit yesterday told the House Un-American Affairs Committee that Goodlin emphatically denied today an article which revealed secrets of the supersonic Bell XS-1 and which was dispatched by a literary agent, uncensored, to Communist Party headquarters in New York.

SHEER NONSENSE, CHARGED

"I don't know where this man Moffit got his information, but he certainly got it all wrong," said Goodlin today at his Rosmond, Calif., home. "It's the sheerest kind of nonsense."

Goodlin also denied that he had any dealings personally with Literary Agent John Weber, head of the literary department of William Morris Theatrical Agency, concerning the article.

"I brought the article, which had been approved both by the AAF and Bell Aircraft, to Weber's office last June and gave it to one of his associates," he said. "I don't even know that Weber ever saw it."

"After they sent the article to their New York office and kept it for three months, I finally sold it myself. It will appear in the January issue of Air Trails magazine, and also a condensed version in Reader's Digest for that month."

"I certainly would welcome an FBI investigation of the whole thing," he said.

Goodlin also denied Moffit's statement that he was fired by Bell Aircraft as a result of the article, declaring a check of Bell records would show he resigned last June.

Weber also said charges that he sent secrets about supersonic aircraft to Communist headquarters were "malicious slander."

FILM FIGURES PROTEST

Thirty-five top movie personalities also protested testimony at the investigation in full-page trade paper advertisements.

The celebrities, who said they were "Disgusted and outraged," included Eddie Cantor, Norman Corwin, Henry Fonda, Ava Gardner, Paulette Goddard, Benny Goodman, Van Heflin, Paul Henreid, Katharine Hepburn, Myrna Loy, Dorothy McGuire, Gregory Peck, Cornel Wilde, Norman Krasna, Edward G. Robinson, Alexander Knox, and Hume Cronin.

EXHIBIT 32. AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF NEW YORK,
County of New York, ss:

HELEN STRAUSS, being duly sworn, deposes and says:

I am employed by William Morris Agency, Inc., at the head of the Literary Department in its New York office. I have been so engaged for a period of

approximately four years. Prior to that time, I was associated with the Story Department of Paramount Pictures, Inc., for approximately nine years.

My first association with Chalmers "Slick" Goodlin was through his manager, Frank Nichols, and that was in approximately March 1947. Prior to that time, I had been informed about Mr. Goodlin by our California office through memoranda that I received and telephone and teletype messages I had exchanged. I had learned from these conversations that Mr. Goodlin was a test pilot for the Bell Aircraft Corp. and he was preparing to pilot a rocket plane through the supersonic structures and that he was a most distinctive pilot and, therefore, one about whom the public would be anxious to learn and whose articles or stories would have considerable interest to the public. From the point of view of capitalizing on the reputation of Mr. Goodlin and his knowledge and ability, I was asked to endeavor to sell articles or stories written, or to be written, by Mr. Goodlin or others in association or collaboration with him.

In order to carry this out, I met with Mr. Nichols, and he gave me the names of the various magazines that had approached him or Mr. Goodlin with regard to obtaining articles from Mr. Goodlin. As I recall, he stated that these magazines were Collier's and Look. There may have been some others, but I don't recall their names at this time. The one I thought most desirable for Mr. Goodlin was Collier's Magazine. In this connection, I endeavored to bring about some association between Mr. Goodlin and Collier's Magazine. Collier's had approached Mr. Goodlin directly through Bell Aircraft Corp. before we ever entered into the situation. I, William Morris Agency, and our California agency were acting in this transaction solely in the capacity of agents and advisors to Mr. Goodlin, for which we would receive a commission of 10% of the amount Mr. Goodlin earned by reason of the services we were to render.

I communicated with the Managing Editor, Joe Alex Morris, with whom I had many transactions in my capacity as agent for various authors, to inquire as to the interest of Collier's in an article or story from Mr. Goodlin. He in turn communicated with Frederick R. Neely, their Aviation Editor in Washington, who in turn informed me that he had been in touch with Walter Bonney, who was in charge of public relations for Bell Aircraft, regarding a possibility of supersonic flight by Goodlin, that they would be interested in publishing an article on the flight, if it were successful. Actually, they were not interested in Goodlin and had originally asked for an exclusive story on Woolems, who was Bell Aircraft's test pilot before Goodlin and who had been killed in a plane crash last year.

The only material that I saw prepared by Mr. Goodlin or anyone associated with him was sent to me by our California office. It consisted of generalized statements which had no relationship whatsoever with the supersonic flight. I just have a general recollection of this material, but I am positive that it did not contain any secret information or any confidential information or any technical information of any kind. I submitted this to Collier's Magazine, and Collier's turned it down.

The only other contact I had with Mr. Goodlin or his manager, Mr. Nichols, came in the form of a telephone conversation between Mr. Goodlin and my assistant, Esther Mrus, which was relayed to me by Miss Mrus, and that was to the effect that Mr. Goodlin stated that he had been successful in selling this article to the Air Trails Magazine. I am informed Miss Mrus advised him that we were pleased that he had been successful in selling the article and wished him well. No commission or compensation of any kind was ever paid to William Morris Agency for our efforts on his behalf.

We do not act for anyone at the present time in the field of aviation. Furthermore, we do not have any information of any kind which by any stretch of the imagination would be deemed to be confidential, secretive, or which in any way involves the safety or welfare of the United States Government.

/S./ HELEN STRAUSS.

Sworn to before me this 25th day of October 1947.

/S./ Leon Kellman,
LEON KELLMAN,

Notary Public New York City, Reg. No. 837-K.

Commission expires March 30, 1949.

EXHIBIT 33. SUBPENA—RUPERT HUGHES

Marshal's Civil Docket
No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Rupert Hughes, 4751 Los Feliz Blvd., Los Angeles, California (residence), to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ———, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 34. New Masses, February 12, 1946, pages 19-22; article, What Shall We Ask of Writers? by Albert Maltz.

Exhibit 35. Daily Worker, February 12, 1946; article by Mike Gold, Change the World, condemning Albert Maltz for writing article designated in exhibit 34.

Exhibit 36. The Worker, April 7, 1946; article, Moving Forward, by Albert Maltz.

EXHIBIT 37. SUBPENA—JAMES K. MCGUINNESS

Marshal's Civil Docket
No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon James K. McGuinness, 911 N. Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, California (residence); Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Culver City, California (business), to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ———, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 38. Telegram, Sam Wood to the Committee on Un-American Activities, October 22, 1947.

EXHIBIT 39. SUBPENA—ROBERT TAYLOR

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Robert Taylor, 807 N. Rodeo Drive, Beverly Hills, California (residence), to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ———, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 40. SUBPENA—HOWARD RUSHMORE

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Stripling.

You are hereby commanded to summon Howard Rushmore to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 22, 1947, at the hour of forthwith, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 22nd day of October 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 41. SUBPENA—MORRIE RYSKIND

Marshal's Civil Docket
No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Morrie Ryskind, 605 N. Hillcrest Avenue, Beverly Hills, California (residence), to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ---- then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 42. Letter: Harold J. Salemsen to Fred Niblo, October 31, 1946.

EXHIBIT 43. SUBPENA—RICHARD MACAULAY

Marshal's Civil Docket
No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Richard Macaulay, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios (writer), Culver City, California (business) to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ---- then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 44. Letter: Harold J. Salemsen to Mr. Richard Macaulay, March 9, 1946.

Exhibit 45. Letter: Dalton Trumbo to Mr. Richard Macaulay, March 22, 1946.

Exhibit 46. Variety, October 14, 1946, article entitled, 'Who Censors What?' by Richard Macaulay.

EXHIBIT 47. SUBPENA—ROBERT MONTGOMERY

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: H. A. Smith.

You are hereby commanded to summon Robert Montgomery to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m. then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 7th day of October 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 48. SUBPENA—GEORGE MURPHY

Marshal's Civil Docket No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED
STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon George Murphy, 911 N. Bedford Drive, Beverly Hills, California (residence) to be and appear before the Un-American

Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ----- then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September, 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 49. SUBPENA—RONALD REAGAN

Marshal's Civil Docket No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Ronald Reagan, 9137 Cordell Drive, Beverly Hills, California (residence) to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ----- then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September, 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 50. SUBPENA—GARY COOPER

Marshal's Civil Docket No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Gary Cooper, 11940 Chaperal St., West Los Angeles, California (residence); Pathe Studios, 9336 W. Washington Blvd., Culver City, Calif., (business) to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ----- then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September, 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 51. Document obtained by the Committee on Un-American Activities from the United States Department of State concerning pamphlets distributed by the Communist Party in Italy during May 1947.

Exhibit 52. Document obtained by the Committee on Un-American Activities by the United States Department of State concerning literature distributed by the Communist Party in Yugoslavia, July 19, 1947.

EXHIBIT 53. SUBPENA—LEO MCCAREY

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Thomas Leo McCarey, Pathe Studios, 9336 W. Washington, Culver City, California (business) to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ----- then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 54. SUBPENA—LELA E. ROGERS

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Lela E. Rogers, 5930 Franklin Ave., Hollywood, California (residence) to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Forthwith, at the hour of ----- then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 55. Peoples' Educational Center, Los Angeles, Calif., 1947 Winter Catalog.

Exhibit 56. Peoples' Educational Center, Los Angeles, California, 1945 Winter Catalog.

EXHIBIT 57. SUBPENA—OLIVER CARLSON

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: H. A. Smith.

You are hereby commanded to summon Oliver Carlson to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on Wednesday, October 22nd, 1947,

at the hour of 10:30 a. m. then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 10th day of October 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 58. NOTE: CORRECTION

Cable address—Disney.

WALT DISNEY PRODUCTIONS,
2400 West Alameda Ave., Burbank, Calif., November 3, 1947.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.
(Attention: Hon. J. Parnell Thomas.)

GENTLEMEN: I am taking the liberty of referring you to my testimony before your committee in Washington, D. C., on October 24, 1947, in the course of which and in answer to a question by your chairman, I stated substantially that when Mr. Sorrell "Pulled the strike," the first people to smear me and put me on the unfair list were certain organizations among which was The League of Women Voters.

Since returning to my office in Burbank, Calif., I have had an opportunity to carefully review my files pertaining to this subject matter. I can now definitely state that while testifying as above I was confused by a similarity of names between two women's organizations. I regret that I named The League of Women Voters when I intended to name the League of Women Shoppers.

Therefore I trust your committee will find it consistent to make requisite amendment to the record with respect to my testimony so as to erase any implication that The League of Women Voters had at any time intervened or taken any action with regard to the matters about which I was being interrogated.

For the information of the committee I am enclosing herewith photostatic copies of letters received from various units of the League of Women Shoppers which are self-explanatory.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Walter E. Disney.
WALTER E. DISNEY.

Encls.

No agreement will be binding on this corporation unless in writing and signed by an officer.

EXHIBIT 58A

HOLLYWOOD LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS
4415 Placidia Ave., North Hollywood, Calif.

<i>Officers</i>	<i>Directors</i>	<i>Sponsors</i>
Chelene Eckerson, president	Josephine Kahn	Mrs. Ira Gershwin
Dorothy Tree, vice president	Judith Kandel	Lucille Gleason
Tatiana Tuttle, treasurer	Dorothy Peterson	Mrs. A. Heist
Dixie Newton, assistant treasurer	Madelene Ruthven	Lillian Hellman
Sylvia Blankfort, secretary	Dorothy Wilson	Mrs. William Jacobson
Natalie Commons, executive secretary		Mrs. Boris Karloff
Mildred Traube, second vice president		Dr. Nadina Kavinoky
	<i>Sponsors</i>	Mrs. Abraham Lehr
	Mrs. E. P. Ryland	Mrs. Norman Kilbourne
	Mrs. Floyd J. Seaman	Mrs. E. J. Luenenschloss
	Mrs. Frank Sently	Eleanore Wilson McAdoo
<i>Directors</i>	Viola Brothers Shore	Mrs. Kenneth McGowan
	Marion Spitzer	Arline MacMahon
Molly Adler	Dr. Louise M. Snyder	Mrs. Leonard Oechsl
Laurie Blankfort	Ruby D. Campbell	Mrs. John C. Packard
Elizabeth Burbank	Mrs. Floyd Covington	Dorothy Parker
Evelyn Capell	Mrs. Oliver Carlson	Luise Rainer
Rhea Chodorov	Mrs. Ernest Dawson	Elizabeth Risdon
Peggy Dunne	Mrs. George Day	Sylvia Sidney
Sue Edmund	Frances Farmer	Gloria Stuart
Elizabeth Faragon	Mrs. Lowell C. Frost	Mrs. George A. Warmer, Jr.

JUNE 17, 1941.

Mr. WALT DISNEY,
Burbank, Calif.

DEAR MR. DISNEY: The National League of Women Shoppers having its offices in New York and having branches all over the United States have sent us a wire asking that a full report on the strike of the Screen Cartoonists Guild in your studio be sent them as soon as possible.

The League of Women Shoppers is a consumers' organization founded on the principles that working conditions are important considerations in the purchase of goods. Our large and active membership will not patronize those establishments where labor is unfairly treated.

When a situation like this arises, it is our policy to make a thorough investigation of it, and we would therefore appreciate the opportunity to talk with you.

We are anxious to obtain your reaction to the situation before consulting the union.

May we have an appointment on Friday, June 20th, 11:30 A. M. We shall telephone Thursday afternoon to confirm this appointment.

Sincerely,

/Signed/ Sylvia Blankfort,
SYLVIA BLANKFORT,

Secretary, Hollywood League of Women Shoppers.

EXHIBIT 58B

Granite 0948

HOLLYWOOD LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS

4415 Placidia Avenue, Hollywood

JULY 3, 1941.

Officers
Chelene Eckerson, president
Dorothy Tree, vice president
Tatina Tuttle, treasurer
Dixie Newton, assistant
treasurer
Sylvia Blankfort, secretary
Natalie Commons, executive
secretary
Mildred Traube, second vice
president

Directors

Molly Adler
Laurie Blankfort
Elizabeth Burbank
Evelyn Capell
Rhea Chodorov
Peggy Dunne
Sue Edmond
Elizabeth Faragon

Directors
Josephine Kahn
Judith Kadel
Dorothy Peterson
Madelene Ruthven
Dorothy Wilson

Sponsors

Ruby D. Campbell
Mrs. Floyd Covington
Mrs. Oliver Carlson
Mrs. Ernest Dawson
Mrs. George Day
Frances Farmer
Mrs. Lowell C. Frost
Mrs. Ira Gershwin
Lucille Gleason
Mrs. A. Heist
Lillian Hellman
Mrs. William Jacobson
Mrs. Boris Karloff

Sponsors
Dr. Nadina Kavinoky
Mrs. Norman Kilbourne
Mrs. Abraham Lehr
Mrs. E. J. Lunenschloss
Eleanor Wilson McAdoo
Mrs. Kenneth McGowan
Arline MacMahon
Mrs. Leonard Oechsli
Mrs. John C. Packard
Dorothy Parker
Luise Rainer
Elizabeth Risdon
Mrs. E. P. Ryland
Mrs. Floyd J. Seaman
Mrs. Frank Scully
Viola Brothers Shore
Sylvia Sidney
Marion Spitzer
Dr. Louise M. Snyder
Gloria Stuart
Mrs. George A. Warmer, Jr.

Mr. WALT DISNEY,
Burbank, California.

DEAR MR. DISNEY: On June 30th, the Board of the Hollywood League of Women Shoppers was presented with the facts of the strike as given to the Investigation Committee, by yourself, the Screen Cartoonists Guild, and the Strikers.

Since the policy of the League of Women Shoppers is to uphold the State and Federal Laws, the Board, after careful consideration of the facts, resolved that the strikers are justified. According to the Federal Law, they are acting within their rights to join a union, bargain collectively, and go on strike for a living wage and security in their jobs. Union discrimination has also been practiced, by your admitted firing of an artist for union activities.

We have seen the three-year contracts your artists must sign when hired. We were appalled to learn the penalties, which you evaded divulging to our committee, if the artists violated the contracts.

The National League of Women Shoppers has received a complete report of our investigation exactly as told to us and they will advise you of their decision. We are informing our membership of our findings and actions and until condi-

tions are amicably settled our members will not patronize those theatres where The Reluctant Dragon, Fantasia, and other Disney pictures are shown. When the strike is settled our membership will be advised to resume their patronage.

We sincerely hope that for the good and welfare of your business and the security and well-being of your employees, whether in your studio or on the picket line, these differences will be speedily solved.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Sylvia Blankfort, *Secretary.*
SYLVIA BLANKFORT, *Secretary.*

EXHIBIT 58C

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS, INC.

National Headquarters, 273 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Tel. Caledonia 5-9395, Cable Address, Shopleagueneewyork

JULY 7, 1941.

<i>Officers</i>	<i>Officers</i>	<i>Sponsors</i>
Honorary president: Aline Davis Hays	Secretary: Iris Winsor	Lucile Webster Gleason
President: Sophia Ames Boyer	Treasurer: Freda Sternberg	Inez Hays Irwin
Vice presidents: Mrs. Sherwood Anderson	<i>Sponsors</i>	Freda Kirchwey
Nina P. Collier	Mary C. Barker	Dorothy Parker
Fannie Cook	Mrs. William O. Douglas	Cornelia Bryce Pinchot
Marion Hathway	Dorothy Canfield Fisher	Mrs. Carl Sandburg
Lillian Hellman		Gale Sondergaard
		Mrs. Stephen S. Wise
		Mary E. Woolley
<i>Branch Leagues</i>		
Boston, Massachusetts: Mrs. J. P. Hocker, 304 Bexley Hall, 52 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge	New Jersey: 207 Market Street, Newark	
Chicago, Illinois: Room 710, 203 North Wabash Avenue	New York: 273 Fifth Avenue	
Columbus, Ohio: Care of Frances Dunn, 2046 West Fifth Avenue	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Care of Madeline Blitzstein, 322 South 16th Street	
Denver, Colorado: Box 82, Capitol Hill Station	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: 206 Stanwyx Street	
Hollywood, California: 6912 Sunset Boulevard	San Francisco, California: Care of Rikee Elsesser, 1580 Masonic Avenue	
Nashville, Tenn.: Care of Mrs. Susie Clark Prince, Room 640, Doctors Building	St. Louis, Missouri: Care of Mrs. Elwood Douglass, 103 N. Sappington Road, Kirkwood	
	Washington, D. C.: 1010 Vermont Avenue NW.	

MR. WALT DISNEY,

Walt Disney Studio,

Buena Vista and Alameda Streets,

Burbank, California.

DEAR MR. DISNEY: In response to the many inquiries which have come to this office, we recently asked the Hollywood League of Women Shoppers to investigate the strike now taking place at your studio.

The League of Women Shoppers is a consumers' organization whose thousands of members believe in using their buying power in such a way as to help workers attain decent living standards and working conditions. We never, in a labor dispute, support either the workers or the management without a full and impartial investigation by one of our League investigating committees. For this reason, the subsequent decisions of our Executive Boards, either local or national, are accepted by many additional thousands of fair-minded consumers throughout the country as fair and just from the point of view of the well-being of American workers.

The National Executive Committee of The League of Women Shoppers has carefully considered the long report sent it by the Hollywood League of Women Shoppers. The committee then voted to support the striking employees in this instance, for the following reasons:

1. The need of the Disney employees for a bona fide union is evidenced by the onerous terms of the 3-year hiring contract, the lack of job security, and the low general wage level, the long hours, and speed-up.

2. On the other hand, you have seemed unwilling to engage in genuine collective bargaining with the union chosen by a majority of your artists, and by speech and action have shown an antiunion bias which makes a fair settlement of your employees' grievances quite impossible.

This office is sending a full report of the investigation to all branch Leagues, with the recommendation that they notify their members and all sympathetic organizations of the facts and of our decision. We also ask that all local theater managers be notified.

We would like to urge you to make every effort to bring about a fair settlement of this dispute in the shortest possible time. We are convinced that only by such an effort on your part can the strike be brought to an end and the Disney Studio considered fair to its employees.

Sincerely yours,

Katharine Armatage (Signed).

KATHARINE ARMATAGE, *Chairman Board*.
Market 3-3642

EXHIBIT 58D

NEW JERSEY LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS

Affiliated with the League of Women Shoppers, Inc.

207 Market Street, Newark, N. J.

Officers

President :
Hannah Smith
Vice Presidents :
Katharine Armatage
Ruth Berthold
Mrs. Lewis H. Loeser
Secretary :
Charlotte Brady
Treasurer :
Rose Hirsch

Mrs. Harry Furness
Beatrice Kaufman
Nathlyn Lerner
Beatrice Mintz
Mary Lorene Read
Frances Semel
Dr. Virginia Wuerthele

Dorothy Parker
Mrs. Gifford Pinchot
Mrs. Carl Sandburg
Gale Sondergaard
Mrs. Stephen S. Wise
Dr. Mary E. Wooley

Local :

Mrs. Henry Barkhom
Mrs. Madison C. Bates
Mrs. Irene Fulhbruegge
Miss Annie P. Hughes
Mrs. Clara Savage Little-
dale
Mrs. David Loeser
Mrs. Amelia B. Moor-
field
Miss Sadie Reisch
Mrs. Harry F. Ward

Sponsors

National :

Mrs. Sherwood Anderson
Mary C. Barker
Mrs. William O. Douglas
Dorothy Canfield Fisher
Lucile Gleason
Inez Hays Irwin
Freda Kirchway

Executive Board

Mrs. Laurence Ackerman
Louise Bendersky
Eleanor Bolan
Grace Cowen
Mrs. Philip J. Dodge
Mrs. Nathaniel L. Foster

Mr. WALT DISNEY,
Burbank, California.

MY DEAR MR. DISNEY: The New Jersey League of Women Shoppers, a local of the League of Women Shoppers, Inc., has been informed of the labor dispute at your studios.

We have received a full report of the investigation made by our Hollywood League, which we presented to our membership, and after careful consideration we accepted the findings of the Hollywood League and endorsed the strike.

The employees' demand for union recognition, shorter working hours, higher wages, and other conditions which, in our opinion, are essential for the maintenance of a decent American standard of living is a just cause for our support. It is our usual procedure to publicize our position in various ways which we consider effective.

We urge a fair and quick settlement of this dispute in order that we may inform our membership and encourage once more patronage of your films.

Sincerely yours,

(s) HANNAH SMITH, *President.*

EXHIBIT 58E

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS OF CHICAGO

State 3146

Affiliated with the National League of Women Shoppers, New York

203 North Wabash, Room 710

JULY 14, 1941.

MANAGER, THE PALACE THEATER,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: The National League of Women Shoppers has endorsed the strike of the Walt Disney artists for recognition and the right of collective bargaining.

This endorsement is a result of the investigation made by the Hollywood League.

We are, therefore, writing to you to advise you of our endorsement and to inform you that our membership feels they will have to wait to see the newest Disney picture, *The Reluctant Dragon*, until such time as the strike is settled, which we hope will be very soon.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Disney Studios, and we trust that you will also advise them directly that we in Chicago would like to see this matter adjusted as quickly as possible.

Very truly yours,

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN SHOPPERS OF CHICAGO,
By _____, *President*.

EXHIBIT 59

Cable Address: Disney

WALT DISNEY PRODUCTIONS

2400 West Alameda Ave., Burbank, California

NOVEMBER, 3, 1947.

Re: Un-American Prop., Vol. 5, made by Washington Reporting Service.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,

House of Representatives,

House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(Attention: Hon. J. Parnell Thomas)

GENTLEMEN: I refer to page 727 of the stenographic transcript of the hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, in the above matter.

In answer to a question by Mr. Smith with respect to one Wm. Pomerance, I stated in effect that Sorrell put him (Pomerance) in charge as business manager of the Cartoonists, and later "he went to the Screen Actors as their business agent."

I request permission to correct the foregoing answer by substituting in lieu of "The Screen Actors" the name of another organization, "The Screen Writers Guild, Inc."

Since returning to my offices in Burbank, California, I have made inquiry and succeeded in refreshing my recollection to the effect that Wm. Pomerance, after his separation from the Screen *Cartoonists* Guild was engaged by the Screen *Writers* Guild.

I thank you in advance for giving this matter your attention.

Respectfully submitted.

(s) Walter E. Disney.
WALTER E. DISNEY.

No Agreement will be binding on this corporation unless in writing and signed by an officer.

EXHIBIT 60

SUBPENA—JOHN HOWARD LAWSON

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 421

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon John Howard Lawson to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23rd, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 A. M., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 18th day of September 1947.

(signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 61. Daily Worker, September 6, 1935, page 5; article by John Howard Lawson.

Exhibit 62. Daily Worker, February 26, 1935, page 5.

EXHIBIT 63

COPY OF COMMUNIST PARTY REGISTRATION CARD—JOHN HOWARD LAWSON
No. 47275.

Name: John Howard Lawson.

1944 Card No. —

Address: 4542 Coldwater Canyon Ave.

City: L. A. County: L. A. State: Cal.

Name of club:

New card issued on: 12/10/44.

194—

(To be filled in by person exchanging card)

Male X Female White X Negro

Occupation: Writer.

Industry: Motion Picture.

Member of: CIO AFL Ind. Union X No Union P. W.

Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker? Yes X No

209

EXHIBIT 64. SUBPENA—ERIC JOHNSTON

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Donald T. Appell.

You are hereby commanded to summon Eric Johnston, President, Motion Picture Association of America, 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas is chairman, and he is to bring with him copies of all resolutions proposed or submitted relating to the investigation of the movie industry by the Committee on Un-American Activities and original minutes pertaining to all meetings held by the Motion Picture Association of America relating to such resolutions for the period May 1 through September 10, 1947, in their chamber in the city of Washington on October 20, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and fake returns of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington this 29th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman.*

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 65. Telegram: Walter E. Disney to the Committee on Un-American Activities, October 24, 1947.

Exhibit 66. Hollywood Reporter, August 22, 1946 (photostatic copy).

EXHIBIT 67

COPY OF COMMUNIST PARTY REGISTRATION CARD—DALTON TRUMBO
47187.

Name: Dalt. T.

1944 Card No. 39300

Address: 620 Beverly Dr.

City: Bev. H. County: L. A. State: Calif.

Name of Club:

New card issued on: Nov. 30.

1944

(To be filled in by person exchanging card)

Male ☒ Female ☐ White ☐ Negro ☐
 Occupation: Writer.
 Industry: Motion Picture.
 Member of: CIO ☐ AFL ☐ Ind. Union ☒ No Union ☐
 Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker? Yes ☒ No ☐

209

EXHIBIT 68. SUBPENA—DALTON TRUMBO

Marshal's Civil Docket
 No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 421

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Dalton Trumbo to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington on October 23rd, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington this 18th day of September 1947

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS, *Chairman*.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk*.

Exhibit 69. Telegram: Committee on Un-American Activities to Mr. Dalton Trumbo, October 11, 1947.

Exhibit 70. Telegram: Committee on Un-American Activities to Mr. Dalton Trumbo, October 13, 1947.

EXHIBIT 71

COPY OF COMMUNIST PARTY REGISTRATION CARD—ALBERT MALTZ

No. 47196. Copy of Communist Party Card—Albert Maltz.
 Name: Albert M. 1944 Card No. 46801
 Address: 6526 Linden Hurst.
 City: L. A. County: L. A. State: Calif.
 Name of Club:
 New card issued on: Nov. 3 1944

 (To be filled in by person exchanging card)

Male ☒ Female ☐ White ☐ Negro ☐
 Occupation: Writer.
 Industry: M. Picture.
 Member of: CIO ☐ AFL ☐ Ind. Union ☐ No Union ☐
 Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker? Yes ☒ No ☐

209

EXHIBIT 72. SUBPENA—ALBERT MALTZ

Marshal's Civil Docket
 No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 421

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Albert Maltz to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23rd, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 18th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 73. SUBPENA—ALVAH BESSIE

Marshal's Civil Docket
No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Alvah Bessie, 369 South Crescent Drive, Beverley Hills, Calif., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 74. Telegram: J. Parnell Thomas, chairman, to Mr. Alvah Bessie, October 11, 1947.

EXHIBIT 75

COPY OF COMMUNIST PARTY REGISTRATION CARD—ALVAH BESSIE

No. 47279.

Name: Alvah Bessie.

1944 Card No. 46836

Address: 4653 Coldwater Canyon Ave.

City: Hollywood. County: L. A. State: Cal.

Name of Club:

New card issued on: 12/10/44.

1944

(To be filled in by person exchanging card)

Male X Female White X Negro

Occupation: Writer.

Industry: Motion Picture.

Member of: CIO AFL Ind. Union X No Union P. W.

Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker? Yes X No

209

EXHIBIT 76. LETTER

INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE OF THEATRICAL STAGE EMPLOYEES AND MOVING PICTURE MACHINE OPERATORS OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

International Building, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York 20, N. Y.

Affiliated with the American Federation of Labor

Richard F. Walsh, International President.

Thomas J. Shea, Assistant International President.

William P. Raoul, General Secretary-Treasurer.

Harland Holmden, First Vice President, 760 Hippodrome Bldg., Cleveland 15, Ohio.

William P. Covert, Second Vice President, 63 McRae Drive, Leaside, Toronto, Ontario,

Canada.

Floyd M. Billingsley, Third Vice President, 230 Jones St., San Francisco 1, California.

James J. Brennan, Fourth Vice President, Ramsey, New Jersey.
 Roger M. Kennedy, Fifth Vice President, 1005 Hofmann Bldg., Detroit 1, Michigan.
 Felix D. Snow, Sixth Vice President, 1017 Washington St., Kansas City 6, Missouri.
 Carl G. Cooper, Seventh Vice President, 136 North Vista St., Hollywood 36, California.
 William C. Barrett, Eighth Vice President, Apt. 304, 1609 No. Normandie Avenue, Hollywood 28, California.
 Louise Wright, Ninth Vice President, Apt. 3, 5012 Victor St., Dallas 14, Texas.
 Telephone: Gladstone 7187.

HOLLYWOOD OFFICE,
 6836 HOLLYWOOD BLVD., SUITE 217-218,
 Hollywood 28, Calif., November 3, 1947.

Hon. J. PARNELL THOMAS,

Chairman of the House of Representatives
Committee on Un-American Activities,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Following through upon my request to have additional evidence introduced into the record of the recent hearing of the committee into the penetration of Communist activity in the Hollywood motion-picture industry, I would like to submit the following material to supplement my testimony given before the committee:

(1) To supplement my testimony that Herbert K. Sorrell has followed the Communist Party line since 1937, with one minor exception, I would like to submit herewith the following:

Ia. An Informational Bulletin, dated November 13, 1945, published by the IATSE, which outlines in detail the record of Herbert K. Sorrell in Communist front activities from 1938 to 1945.

Ib. In addition, I would like to submit a report of the California State Committee on Un-American Activities, dated February 19, 1946. This report also outlines the activities of Herbert K. Sorrell and in addition contains the testimony of Clark Sellers and John Harris concerning the documents which I introduced in evidence at the committee hearing. Contained also in this document is a letter by the Committee, written to C. Don Field, in which the Committee sets forth as follows:

"The secret Communist Party affiliation of Herbert K. Sorrell is therefore established beyond a shadow of a reasonable doubt and his activities explained in light of current Communist Party purposes and objectives. There is no doubt in the minds of the members of the Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities that Herbert K. Sorrell is a member of the Communist Party and presently an important stooge and tool of Communist Party design for the destruction of American Federation of Labor unions in Hollywood and the establishment of Communist influence and domination in the motion-picture industry."

Ic. An excerpt from the Report of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, in which is cited a report from Herb Sorrell, outlining the success which his Conference had had in carrying on educational work on the Soviet Union in Hollywood. The next paragraph, which quotes Louis Weinstock, should also be noted. Mr. Weinstock is a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party of America. Mr. Weinstock's remarks would indicate that Mr. Sorrell had not only been able to induce groups in Hollywood into supporting the Communist Party program, but had been instrumental in throwing the entire Painters International Union behind this program.

Id. In this connection I would also like to submit a photostat of the People's World, dated September 6, 1946, which indicates the part which Herbert K. Sorrell played in attempting to get the Painters International Union to support the World Federation of Trade Unions, which was opposed by the American Federation of Labor because it was dominated by Soviet Russia. In this clipping it will be noted that Mr. Sorrell was supported by Mr. Courtney Ward, who was ousted by President William Green, President of the American Federation of Labor, from the Cleveland Federation of Labor because of his pro-communist activities.

Ie. Inserted also in connection with Sorrell's activities are excerpts from the Peoples Daily World dated: 3/8/40, 4/19/40, 5/17/40, 11/2/44, and July 24, 1944.

Iee. The first one shows Mr. Sorrell identified with known communists and their efforts to organize the Workers Alliance. Emil Freed is an admitted communist; La Rue McCormick is an admitted communist; and Joe Williams is an official representative of the Peoples Daily World.

If. The second photostat shows the association of Herbert K. Sorrell, along with other prominent pro-communists, including Dalton Trumbo and Carey McWilliams, in the "Yanks are Not Coming" program, a program designed to frus-

trate the activities of this country in aiding England during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact.

1g. The third photostat substantiates Mr. Sorrell's association with the Schneiderman Defense Committee.

1h. The fourth photostat shows Mr. Sorrell, along with John Howard Lawson and others, as sponsoring La Rue McCormick, communist candidate for the office of State Senator.

1i. The last photostat shows Mr. Sorrell associated with Mr. John Howard Lawson as Hollywood Representatives supporting the People's World.

There are many other such documents which could be produced. These are only a few picked at random to support the material printed in the IATSE Bulletin.

(2) With respect to the second point on which I want to submit material, i. e., the adherence of the Conference of Studio Unions to Communist Party programs, I would like to submit the following:

2a. A dossier of the activities of the Conference showing support of various pro-communist groups from August 12 to July 12, 1944. This was taken from minutes which have come into my possession, but which do not extend beyond 1944.

2b. The attached pamphlet entitled "Manifesto of the World Labor Conference," showing Conference support of the World Trade Union Conference, which program they have religiously supported since its inception, despite the opposition of the American Federation of Labor and of the International unions with which the local unions in the Conference are affiliated. The Conference of Studio Unions also supported the National Service Act which was one of the best tests of communist domination that has been found. Only those unions in America which were under the complete domination of the communists supported the National Service Act in 1942 and 1943.

2c. Other material which I would like to submit in this connection is a clipping from the Hollywood Citizen News of December 11, 1946. This was a meeting of the "Southern California Committee to Win the Peace." The Conference of Studio Unions is listed, along with many other communist and pro-communist organizations, as a contributor to this program.

2d. I am enclosing transcript of a radio program broadcast by Sam Balter, who was sponsored for quite some time by the Conference of Studio Unions. The script is a complete text of his address. You will notice the subtlety with which the world situation is discussed by Mr. Balter. He then gives equal importance to the line of the Conference of Studio Unions concerning the Hollywood Studio strike, following up with a discussion of the United Nations. You will find Mr. Balter's remarks on the United Nations at the end of the war in complete accord with Soviet Russia. This is only one script of many used by Mr. Balter which follows the party line religiously.

(3) I am also enclosing herewith various copies of the CSU News. You will find in these a great deal of evidence of procommunist activities:

3a. CSU News, Vol. 1, No. 8, dated December 28, 1946, on page 3, carries a notice urging the Conference of Studio Unions to listen to Averill Berman and Peter De Lima. Both of these commentators have records of procommunist leanings so far as their dissemination of the news is concerned.

3b. On page 4 of Vol. 1, No. 9, you will find an advertisement supporting the Actors Lab.

3c. Vol. 1, No. 12, page 4, you will find a story concerning the activities of the procommunist French unions and their support of the Conference of Studio Unions.

3d. In Vol. 1, No. 14, you will find speeches by Vincente Lombardo Toledano, well-known Mexican Communist, in support of the Conference of Studio Unions.

3e. In Vol. 1, No. 15, Feb. 15, 1947, you will find a story concerning the support of Latin American Unions arranged by Holedano, advocating boycotting of American pictures.

3f. In Vol. 1, No. 16, page 3, you will find a paragraph urging support of Russian pictures as compared with American pictures. You will also find an ad on page 2 of the same issue.

3g. In Vol. 1, No. 17, page 3, you will find the pledge of Egyptian unions in boycotting American films.

3h. Vol. 1, No. 19, has an article urging that the workers support the Peoples Educational Center, which has been branded as a Communist school.

3i. In Vol. 1, No. 22, you will find an editorial urging an investigation of the Hollywood strike situation by a Congressional committee, although these same groups are screaming against the investigation of communism in the motion-

picture industry. On page 4 of the same issue is another item urging people to listen to Averill Berman.

3j. In Vol. 1, No. 23, page 2, is an article urging support of the Peoples Educational Center.

3k. In Vol. 1, No. 26, there is an item remarking about support from the Western Council for Progressive Business, Labor, and Agriculture. This is an organization which is sponsoring pro-Russian commentators.

3l. Vol. 1, No. 29, shows their enthusiastic support of the PCA.

3m. Vol. 1, No. 35, shows the support of the pro-communist Mexican Workers Union in favor of the CSU.

Other information indicating communist support of the Conference of Studio Unions was the fact that Paul Robeson, admitted procommunist, was the principal speaker at their meeting on March 16, 1947.

In the Motion Picture Daily of the 17th of March 1947 was an item stating that Louis Weinstock, admitted member of the National Executive Council of the Communist Party, had raised \$10,000 in support of the strike of the Conference of Studio Unions.

(4) a-j. Additional evidence to support the charge that the communists were active in the support of the strike is contained in various bulletins published by the Conference of Studio Unions between the dates of January 15, 1947, and February 15, 1947. In these bulletins you will find various items which show their association with foreign and procommunist unions in an effort to boycott American pictures, support of pro-Soviet commentators, support of the Peoples Educational Center, and support of various other communist fronts.

(5) In connection with the evidence that the strikes were supported by communists, I submit the record of Emil Freed, 5a, admitted communist, who was arrested in the picket line supporting the Conference of Studio Unions and sentenced to one year in jail as a result of his defiance of the court orders. In this connection the facts that the American Youth for Democracy was openly used as a means of obtaining mass pickets and the report of the C. Don Field Committee, 5b, which specifically investigated and found evidence of communist activity in the picket lines of the Conference of Studio Unions are important.

(6) I am also submitting herewith a complete file of the reports of Jeff Kibre, portions of which I read into the record and which, in my opinion, formed the most important evidence we have of the communist plot to take over the unions in the motion picture industry.

(7) I also enclose herewith a copy of the Constitution and By-Laws of the IATSE, and I call your particular attention to the special laws on page 79, which were passed by our recent Convention because of the threat of our existence by communist infiltration and efforts to dominate our unions.

(8) I also enclose herewith for the Committee's consideration a complete file of the IATSE Bulletins put out during the 1945 strike, in which we set forth in various ways the association of Communists in the strike and in the motion picture industry.

(9) In connection with the actions of our Local 683, I would like to submit a letter which I sent out to all unions of the IATSE setting forth the pro-communist leanings of the officers of Local 683, which later revolted and joined the Conference of Studio Unions in its effort to drive the IATSE out of the Hollywood labor picture. I would also like to point out the fact that the former officers of Local 683 of the IATSE were instrumental in the forming and the direction of the Peoples Educational Center; they were instrumental in forming and directing the affairs of the Conference of Studio Unions until 1944. Our analysis of their activity would indicate that they formed the Conference and established the basis for an attack on the IATSE by the Conference of Studio Unions, but then withdrew from the Conference because they felt they could not remain in the Conference when the fight came out into the open. However, at a critical time in the period of the Conference strike against the IATSE, they openly revolted and joined the strike. There are reams of evidence to substantiate that the officers who controlled the affairs of Local 683, IATSE, between 1940 and 1947, were strict adherents to communist party programs and policy.

I trust this will be of value to the Committee. I shall be glad to submit any further material which the Committee might desire to substantiate my testimony.

Respectfully yours,

/s/ ROY M. BREWER,
International Representative.

RMB:LF

P. S. The attached excerpts from DAILY VARIETY, dated March 12, 1945, and April 2, 1945, show the so-called "rank and file activity" led by Irving Henschel in the 1945 strike, who is mentioned in the Jeff Kibre Reports as a party member of three years standing, to 1938, and proves conclusively that the rebellion within the IATSE in support of the studio strike was fomented and directed by communists and pro-communists.

In addition to the other material which I have outlined above, I am sending you a copy of a series of the "Hollywood Closeup" which we published in 1945 and 1946, which contain a series of open letters. These open letters were directed only to those persons who, through personal activity or organizational activity, had injected themselves into the strike on the side of the Conference of Studio Unions. You will find some interesting questions in these articles, all of which have gone unanswered—not one single one of these open letters were answered by any of the persons to whom they were directed.

EXHIBIT 77. SUBPENA—SAMUEL ORNITZ

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 488

By AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Samuel Ornitz to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 23d day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 78. Telegram: The Committee on Un-American Activities to Samuel Ornitz, October 11, 1947.

EXHIBIT 79. COMMUNIST PARTY REGISTRATION CARD OF SAMUEL ORNITZ

No. 47181

1944 Card No. 41826

Name: Sam O.

Address: 1044 S. Redondo.

City: L. A. County: L. A. State: Cal.

Name of Club:

New card issued on: Dec. 2,

1944

(To be filled in by person exchanging card)

Male ☒ Female ☐ White ☐ Negro ☐

Occupation: Writer.

Industry: M. Picture.

Member of: CIO ☐ AFL ☐ Ind. Union ☐ No Union ☐

Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker? Yes ☒ No ☐

EXHIBIT S0. SUBPENA—HERBERT BIBERMAN

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 488

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Herbert Biberman to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the City of Washington, this 19th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, Clerk.

Exhibit S1. Telegram: The Committee on Un-American Activities to Herbert Biberman, October 11, 1947.

EXHIBIT S2. COMMUNIST PARTY REGISTRATION CARD—HERBERT BIBERMAN

No. 47267

1944 Card No. 46844

Name: Herbert Biberman.

Address: 3257 Inonda Dr.

City: L. A. County: L. A. State: Cal.

Name of club:

New card issued on: 12/10/44.

194—

(To be filled in by person exchanging card)

Male ☒ Female ☐ White ☐ Negro ☐

Occupation: Director.

Industry: Motion Picture.

Member of: CIO ☐ AFL ☐ Ind. Union ☐ No union ☐ P. ☐ W. ☐

Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker? Yes ☒ No ☐

209

EXHIBIT S3. SUBPENA—EMMET LAVERY

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 486

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Emmet Lavery to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on _____, at the hour of _____, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 25th day of September 1947.

(signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 84. SUBPENA—EDWARD DMYTRYK

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 421

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Edward Dmytryk to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23rd, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 A. M., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 18th day of September 1947.

(signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 85. Telegram: The Committee on Un-American Activities to Edward Dmytryk, October 11, 1947.

EXHIBIT 86. SUBPENA—ADRIAN SCOTT

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 421

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Robert Adrian Scott, generally known as Adrian Scott, to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23rd, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 A. M., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 18th day of September 1947.

(signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

Exhibit 87. Telegram: Committee on Un-American Activities to Adrian Scott, October 11, 1947.

Exhibit 88. Letter: Dore Schary, on letterhead of Vanguard Films, to Emmet Lavery, April 17, 1945.

EXHIBIT 89. SUBPENA—RING LARDNER, JR.

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 488

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Ring Lardner, Jr., to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas, of New Jersey, is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23rd, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 A. M., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 19th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,

Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, *Clerk.*

EXHIBIT 90. COMMUNIST PARTY REGISTRATION CARD—RING LARDNER, JR.

No. 47180

1944 Card No. 46808

Name: Ring L.

Address: 447 Loring.

City: L. A. County: L. A. State: Calif.

Name of Club:

New card issued on: Nov. 30.

1944

(To be filled in by person exchanging card)

Male ☒ Female ☐ White ☐ Negro ☐

Occupation: Writer.

Industry: M. Picture.

Member of: CIO ☐ AFL ☐ Ind. Union ☒ No Union.

Is member club subscriber for Daily Worker? Yes ☒ No.

209

EXHIBIT 91. SUBPENA—LESTER COLE

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 421

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Lester Cole to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23rd, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 18th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, Clerk.

EXHIBIT 92. COMMUNIST PARTY REGISTRATION CARD—LESTER COLE

No. 47226 1944 Card No. —
Name: Lester Cole.
Address: ?
City: L. A. County: L. A. State: Calif.
Name of club:
New card issued on: Dec. 16. 1944

(to be filled in by person exchanging card)

Male X Female White X Negro
Occupation: Writer.
Industry: Motion Picture.
Member of: CIO AFL Ind. Union X No Union
Is member club subscriber for Su. Worker? Yes X No
209

EXHIBIT 93. SUBPENA—BERTOLD BRECHT

Marshal's Civil Docket

No. 32080, Vol. 58, Page 421

BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To: Robert E. Clark, United States Marshal.

You are hereby commanded to summon Bertold Eugen Friedrich Brecht, generally known as Bert Brecht, to be and appear before the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. J. Parnell Thomas of New Jersey is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, on October 23rd, 1947, at the hour of 10:30 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said Committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said Committee.

Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 18th day of September 1947.

(Signed) J. PARNELL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Attest:

JOHN ANDREWS, Clerk.

Exhibit 94. Ost Und West, July 1946, Magazine printed in Germany, containing part of the play, Private Life of the Master Race, by Bert Brecht.

Exhibit 95. International Literature No. 5, 1937, article by Sergei Tretyakov on an interview with Bert Brecht.

Exhibit 96. Bulletin No. 2, International Theatre, 1934, pp. 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7.

Exhibit 97. International Theatre, October 1934, p. 3.

Exhibit 98. International Theatre, No. 3-4, 1934, p. 56.

Exhibit 99. New Theater, November 1934, p. 11, article entitled "Straight From the Shoulder," by John Howard Lawson.



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05445 3186



